United Nations S/PV.4143

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4143rd meeting

Wednesday, 17 May 2000, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cappagli
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Fowler
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Ag Oumar
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Yel'chenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Holbrooke

Agenda

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Security Council Mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4-8 May 2000 (S/2000/416).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-43573 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Security Council Mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4-8 May 2000 (S/2000/416)

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa, Swaziland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mwamba Kapanga (Democratic Republic of the Congo) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Baali (Algeria), Mr. Mmualefe (Botswana), Mr. Akasaka (Japan), Mr. Dorda (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan), Mr. Monteiro (Portugal), Mr. Kumalo (South Africa), Mr. Nhleko (Swaziland), Mr. Mwakawago (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Daka (Zambia) and Mr. Jokonya (Zimbabwe) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report on the Security Council mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, document S/2000/416.

I give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Richard Holbrooke, head of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Mr. Holbrooke (United States of America): Allow me to apologize for my tardiness; as I was arriving here, the Secretary-General contacted me regarding the fast-moving developments in Sierra Leone concerning Mr. Foday Sankoh, who as we all know is at the airport area in Freetown. He is wounded; I believe he is receiving medical treatment from British doctors. The circumstances are still very murky, and the Secretary-General has been seized of the issue. I profusely apologize for holding up the convening of this meeting, particularly since, as head of the Security Council delegation, I recognize my obligation to begin this discussion.

I congratulate you, Mr. President, on the extraordinary way in which you have handled a month in which nothing has gone according to plan. Every day there has been something new; it has been a difficult period during which to oversee the Security Council.

It is a great honour, Sir, to have been asked by you and by your predecessor, Ambassador Fowler, to chair the delegation that went to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and ultimately to the Horn of Africa. I want to stress that the seven nations took no national positions; there was a consensus throughout. I would like to speak in the same capacity today, following up on the report that Ambassador van Walsum, Ambassador Greenstock and my other colleagues gave last week while I was still overseas.

The fact that we spoke with one voice carried a very powerful message. Three representatives from Africa — Tunisia, Namibia and Mali; three representatives from the European Union — the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands; and an American: this was an extraordinarily well balanced trip. We made it clear, however, that we were also speaking for the eight countries not present. None of our interlocutors could see any differences between us because there were none. The disagreements that often occur in this Chamber simply were not present on this trip. It was a great privilege to be the chair of such a diverse group of talented diplomats. Every single one of the seven ambassadors spoke in every meeting, on every issue, interchangeably. This symbolized to our interlocutors the importance of African leadership in the Security Council and in the United Nations at large. To the other four members of the delegation it showed that Africans were willing and eager to share the burdens of peacemaking in Africa and beyond, and to

the rest of the world a delegation so carefully balanced sent a very powerful symbol.

I think that the three missions that the Security Council has authorized in the past eight months — to East Timor under Ambassador Andjaba, to Kosovo under Ambassador Chowdhury, and this one — are also an important emerging aspect of Security Council activities. This mission fell somewhere between a fact-finding mission, a report to the Security Council and, as it turned out almost inadvertently, a negotiating mission, at least twice: over the crisis in Kisangani and in our unexpected diversion to the Horn.

The trip was not about tourism. It is critical that we get the Security Council out of this magnificent Chamber, out of presidential palaces and luxury hotels, and into the real world. In Kinshasa, for example, we held simultaneous meetings with an ecumenical religious delegation, leaders of civil-society organizations and representatives of political parties. Three of our team, Ambassador Andjaba, Ambassador Greenstock and Ambassador van Walsum, made an extraordinary trip to Kananga, which I hope they will describe in more detail. Members may have seen reports of it on television; it was certainly the emotional high point of the trip, and the four of us who remained in Kinshasa deeply envied their opportunity, which was in essence a chance to see the people of the Congo in a massive human demonstration of a desire for peace.

In every meeting, we heard a loud and unmistakable endorsement of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Based on these remarkable meetings, I think we can say the following about the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: they want peace; they want the withdrawal of outside forces; they do not want to live under foreign occupation; they do not want to see their rights threatened or their resources plundered. They want the Congolese rebel movements to lay down their arms and commit to a political process aimed at forging a new dispensation. They want armed insurgents from neighbouring States, such as the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces, Interahamwe and UNITA, to leave their country forever. They want the present Government to engage in the national dialogue and abide by its results. They want to live in a vibrant State built on solid democratic institutions, and they want economic opportunities and the freedom to travel within their own country which is their right.

I want to underline that we went on this trip, however, not in an effort to undermine the existing Government. We reinforced and stressed to President Kabila at all times that we deal with him as the President of the country and that the national dialogue is part of the Lusaka peace process. I mention that because it is a matter of great concern to the Government what the national dialogue's real purpose is, and I need to underline that everything we did was designed to further that process. It is the only way forward and the only way to address the yearnings of the Congolese people. There is no military solution to the present conflict.

Our efforts must focus on two areas. We must use all our collective influence to keep all the signatories firmly within the Lusaka Agreement. It is the only way forward; if one party is allowed to violate it, others will also violate it. We must strengthen the regional and international consensus for peace based on Lusaka.

There is one area of our report that we need to underline: our unanimous view that Council decisions and actions in the Congo should not be affected by the dangerous and terrible events in Sierra Leone. This is difficult. We recognized, and it was clear on every day of the trip, that the shadow of Sierra Leone was hanging over United Nations peacekeeping, not only in Africa, but around the world. But there was no direct effect of the events in Sierra Leone in the Congo or on the Lusaka peace process. Sierra Leone is not a metaphor for Africa; it is not a metaphor for United Nations peacekeeping. The trip reinforced our belief, and my personal belief, that Africa is as diverse as any other collection of 53 independent nations in the world. The three conflicts that immediately preoccupy us — the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia-Eritrea and Sierra Leone — dominated our mission, of course, but it is immediately clear that they are as diverse in scope and kind as East Timor, southern Lebanon and Kosovo. It is a fallacy based on superficial and insufficient knowledge to say that the failure of the Lomé accords in Sierra Leone intrinsically implies an inevitable failure elsewhere, simply because the elsewhere is on the same continent.

That being said, we must get peacekeeping right. And that extends far beyond the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Sierra Leone illustrates the dangers of getting it wrong. Peacekeeping is this institution's core function,

the one that was foremost in the founders' minds 55 years ago. Whether the United Nations succeeds or fails in the twenty-first century, and whether this great institution, the Security Council, continues to be the world's pre-eminent forum for peace and security, depends in large part on the future of peacekeeping.

Yesterday in the Fifth Committee we had an important discussion on the current challenge to peacekeeping and how together we must work to fix peacekeeping in order to save it. This means addressing the shortcomings, and how we finance peacekeeping, as well as improving how the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) operates. It will not happen overnight. It will require all of us to make tough choices. But if we fail to act, if we allow the gap between capacity and demand to widen even further, then the United Nations and all the people depending on it around the world will suffer.

I am particularly grateful for the efforts and support expressed yesterday by many speakers in the Fifth Committee. What they discussed in that Committee yesterday has immense importance for our deliberations here, and I would particularly single out the countries that yesterday voluntarily said they were prepared to move from group C to group B in financing. Five have already come forward — Cyprus, Israel, Hungary, Estonia and the Philippines — and others have indicated their intention to do the same. This strengthens our efforts, because it begins to broaden the financial base by which peacekeeping will be funded.

Let us also praise the men and women of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) and of the specialized agencies, who work under difficult conditions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its neighbours, with special praise reserved for the Special Representative, Ambassador Morjane, and the Force Commander, General Diallo. They are doing outstanding jobs under difficult circumstances. We recall General Diallo's courageous defence of Monrovia in 1992, and we saw on this trip that he also possesses equal diplomatic skills.

MONUC's deployment in adequate conditions of security and cooperation should remain a key priority. We took a major step forward on the first day of the trip with the signing of the status-of-forces agreement in the presence of President Kabila, who decided to change his schedule to attend the signing ceremony. This essential step is now behind us. We are inclined to believe that all the States signatories to Lusaka are in favour of MONUC deployment and will, if necessary, bring pressure to bear on any reluctant parties to follow suit.

Let me be frank on another problem that was all too obvious and cannot be disguised — the strains that continue to exist between the Joint Military Commission (JMC) and MONUC. We met with the JMC in Lusaka. The meeting raised questions as to how we can move forward, and we hope that those questions can be addressed. We remain convinced that the JMC should be physically co-located with MONUC and must be a permanently sitting body that can respond to breaking events on the ground as part of a joint effort. I want to stress to those of you who were not with us that there was a linguistic misunderstanding between us in this room and the people on the ground, which we only realized during the trip — and that is that the word "co-location" has a different meaning in Africa than it did here. When we talked about "co-location", we talked merely about MONUC and the JMC being in the same building. That was not the issue to our friends in Africa. The issue was what city the JMC would go to. This was quite different from what we expected. No one we talked to objected to sharing a building. But several of the Lusaka peace signatories stated that they will not send their representatives to the JMC to Kinshasa at this time, and they gave us little hope to believe that they wanted to send them ever. So this is an unresolved problem that I believe we were not adequately aware of until we got there, and it requires our attention. I want to clarify it, because the same word, "co-location", had two significantly different meanings.

As a result of the meetings in Lusaka with the JMC and the Political Committee, Ambassador Levitte, in his prospective capacity as President of the Security Council in the month of June, invited the Political Committee to come to New York on or about 16 June. I thank our good friend Jean-David Levitte for this important initiative. I believe this will be a critical meeting. I am sure Ambassador Levitte will have more to say on it, but I would draw everyone's attention to the fact that this will be another step forward in the emerging joint Organization of African Unity (OAU)-Security Council collaboration in furtherance of the Lusaka Agreement. It will be a very important meeting,

or to be more precise, series of meetings, and I hope we can all protect the dates of 15 and 16 June on the calendar, awaiting instructions from Ambassador Levitte in his capacity as June President.

We raised only two issues with the Political Committee — the national dialogue and the need to disarm non-signatory armed groups operating in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The members of the Political Committee stated clearly that they wished to keep the national dialogue in the hands of the Congolese people, but they did engage us on the question of the armed groups. I think it is vitally important that this be one of the main topics for discussion in June; a successful disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement campaign is essential for the success of Lusaka.

Finally, let me address the unexpected outbreak of fighting between Ugandan and Rwandan forces in Kisangani on the second day of our trip. At first, we feared that the fighting in Kisangani would wreck our trip. In fact, in an unexpected way, it provided us with a challenge and an opportunity that, I am proud to say, the seven nations of this special mission addressed. In what amounted to de facto mini-shuttle diplomacy, the seven nations of the Security Council mission negotiated, between President Kagame and President Museveni, face to face and by telephone, a Security Council/Government of Rwanda/Government of Uganda statement issued on 8 May and reaffirmed two days ago in their summit in the United Republic of Tanzania. The fighting then stopped. If anyone wants additional proof of the precedent that Ambassador Andjaba set in East Timor of the capability of Security Council missions, I think this once again illustrates that, under certain circumstances, the Security Council can, as it did again here, and particularly in East Timor, make significant strides forward.

This opportunity will, however, require implementation; both President Kagame and President Museveni made it absolutely clear that they were prepared to demilitarize Kisangani, but they wanted to do full demilitarization only when MONUC forces got to Kisangani. I also talked with President Mugabe and President Kabila about this arrangement before it was announced. Both President Kabila and President Mugabe welcomed the announcement, and both of them said that they thought it was potentially a model for the successful implementation of all of the Lusaka Agreement. However, it needs to be stressed, particularly to our colleagues in the DPKO office, that time is essential. It is vitally important that the forces from MONUC that will go to Kisangani get there ahead of the initial deployment schedule. Dates like July will not work for Kisangani. I understand that the Secretary-General has already been in touch with several countries about this. I think I can safely say, speaking for the members of the Security Council mission, that we believe that getting a United Nations unit, of whatever nationality, to Kisangani immediately, in the next few weeks, is deemed appropriate, is absolutely critical. Otherwise, the risk of war beginning again is very substantial.

I also wish to draw the Council's attention to the very positive announcements and statements coming from the Government of South Africa concerning their readiness to play a more active role in the process.

In conclusion, we remain convinced that the link between the exploitation of natural resources and the continuation of the conflict is a critical area for the Council's further investigation. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Angola and Sierra Leone are all adversely affected by the plundering of their natural resources, even though the actual circumstances vary from country to country. But these issues are central to peacekeeping, and they need to be looked at in the Democratic Republic of the Congo context.

As we said on our last day in Asmara, by the end of the trip, including the diversion we took to the Horn at your instructions, Mr. President, it was difficult to tell whether we had been on the road a week or a year. My colleagues and I felt sleep-deprived, either underfed and overfed, depending on where we were, and constantly on the move. But I assure you, Mr. President, that by arriving at this consensus we feel we served the purposes of the Security Council. On a personal basis, I would gladly travel with any and all of them again under the chairmanship of any of my six colleagues, and I hope that when they say similar things about me that they actually mean them.

I thank you, Mr. President, for the honour of asking me to lead this delegation. I apologize for being late, but I want to state that under the most unusual circumstances it was one of the most satisfying experiences of my professional life, and despite the enormous difficulties and our inability at the last minute to prevent what turned out to be an inevitable resumption of hostilities between Ethiopia and Eritrea,

I believe that we move forward the cause of peace in our primary mission, and if we can address the fresh opportunity that Kisangani has put before us, we can actually make genuine progress. But once again, as in all of these issues, implementation is what matters, not simply the paper agreements.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): On behalf of the Council, I would like to express gratitude and appreciation to all the members of the Security Council mission, ably led by Ambassador Holbrooke, for the manner in which they discharged their important responsibility on behalf of the Council.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): I am very grateful to Ambassador Holbrooke for his report, and as the first member of the mission to speak after him, I wish to thank him for his generous words about the mission and the members of the mission. I echo everything he said about the value, the pressures and the enjoyment of being on the mission, and I would like to pay tribute to him as leader. It may have seemed, from what one saw in the media and on the television, that this was a one-man mission. One would be wise to imagine what it would have been like if Ambassador Holbrooke had been a mere member of the mission, and not its leader. But I would like to say that he led the mission with a sense of inclusiveness and equality among members of the mission that was both an example and an inspiration to us, and I would like to thank him for that.

It is also important that we recognize how much we owed on that mission to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), Ambassador Morjane, General Diallo, the people on the ground who looked after us and to the Secretariat staff who came with us and looked after and supported us in extremely difficult circumstances. Nor could we have done without a remarkable service from the Egyptian company MC, which gave us an aircraft and a crew with remarkable support for the journey that we had to accomplish. The third tribute has to go to the Governments that we met. From President Kabila onwards, there was a responsiveness, an interest and a willingness to do business on the detail that was extremely important to the mission.

I believe that overall the mission accomplished a timely and much-needed boost to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and beyond that it demonstrated a commitment that we had only evinced from this Chamber previously of the Security Council to problem-solving in Africa on the ground, which was and is extremely important in raising the morale of Africans and people dealing with Africa that the Security Council is not going to let go of the need to address the problems we are facing at the moment. The fact that we did this when we were there, I think, was a very important symbol of that.

Yes, as Ambassador Holbrooke has indicated, it was also important for three of us to get out to a provincial town in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Kananga is a city of 700,000 people with no electricity supply at present, with no regular water supply, but with a spirit for peace and an organization in difficult circumstances under a remarkable provincial governor that I think was an inspiration to those of who travelled to that city. The look on the faces of the people in the streets of Kananga calling out for peace as we went past is an abiding memory of that mission.

It reminds me of a similar visit I paid a few weeks earlier to a town in Sierra Leone, only 30 kilometres outside Freetown, where the people had just come back to a city without electricity or water and were calling upon the British team that was there for peace in exactly the same way. That city has now been overrun again by the Revolutionary United Front. It is empty. The people have fled out into the bush. I think we have got to make sure that that does not happen to Kananga or to the other cities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. If, as Ambassador Holbrooke has said and as our report says, Sierra Leone is not to cast a shadow over what we are trying to do in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it also reminds the leaders of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the leaders involved in the Lusaka process of what can happen again to the Democratic Republic of the Congo if the ceasefire breaks down and we come back again to trying to solve these long-standing differences by military means rather than by addressing the political root.

That means we must now follow up quickly on the report's recommendations, because the Lusaka parties are looking for results, the ceasefire is holding but it is fragile and, in particular, Kisangani is still tense. I think we achieved something there, but MONUC has got to follow up quickly, and the capacity of the observers there to act on what we achieved on

Kisangani is absolutely vital. The wider assurances that we received while we were there, on security and access for the United Nations to Kisangani, must be followed up. Part of this is the agreement between the leaders of Uganda and Rwanda to deconflict in Kisangani. They met again in Tanzania on 14 May. We have had reports about that meeting to the effect that they wish to reaffirm their commitment not just to the Lusaka Agreement, but to the withdrawal of all their troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo in due course and to this agreement in particular, the Rwakitura agreement signed at President Museveni's farm, to reduce their forces at Kisangani to no more than two companies each. That is a very important piece of follow-up.

On the issue of co-location, we have said in our report that Kisangani is at least a prime candidate for co-location, both of MONUC and the Joint Military Commission (JMC) together, and for the national dialogue. It would be helpful if the Council could have an assessment from the Secretariat, and from MONUC through the Secretariat, on the practicality of using Kisangani in this way. We would like to know something about the logistical and resource requirements of taking this route and whether they think it is going to be generally acceptable to the parties. I hope, Sir, that under your presidency we can come back to this point quite quickly; otherwise, there will be no sense of follow-up to what we achieved in Kisangani, which will be only short-term and will evaporate unless there is this follow-up.

This is true also, but perhaps in a longer time-frame, for disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement. We raised this with the Political Committee, and we will need to raise it again when the Political Committee comes to New York in June. We need to prepare a way forward on disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement, which gives a role not just to the United Nations presence on the ground, but also to the Joint Military Commission, where I think there could be a specific function for the JMC as regards the precise definition of the groups we are talking about and a monitoring of early action on disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement. That is something we would like to see taken forward under Ambassador Levitte's presidency next month.

On the national dialogue, we have to recognize that the parties will not leave aside the military option unless the political option is alive and running. We recognized on the mission that all the Governments, especially Kinshasa, want to see the proper arrangements made for this and want everybody to get a move on, but we think that facilitator Masire's timetable for a beginning of the national dialogue in early July is, in the circumstances, the only realistic one and the international community should support it. He needs funds — not just pledges, but disbursements — and all of us need to work to ensure that that happens.

We also need to drive home the message in this debate and beyond that the national dialogue is for the Congolese people to decide on. The substance of it is for the Congolese people; the outside facilitation is to provide the mechanism for that. The outside mechanism will not affect or decide the substance. If we can give that clear message, then I think all parties will be prepared to proceed with this in a way which removes their apprehensions.

I echo Ambassador Holbrooke's remarks on the need to move also on an expert panel on illegal exploitation of resources. When we next meet on this, we need to take action on that. That panel needs a mandate and it needs a decision by the Council. The United Kingdom would like to see early movement on it.

Finally, let us come back to the point that the Democratic Republic of the Congo needs to be judged on its merits. We are focusing on Sierra Leone this week, perhaps next week, but we have to come back to the next steps on the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In asking the Secretariat for further work on this, could it please also let us know frankly if its preoccupation with Sierra Leone is having an effect on its ability to deal with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. If that is the case, it must have immediate reinforcement, because the needs of the Congo cannot wait for other problems elsewhere to be solved before we take up the issues that we uncovered and took forward on our mission. The follow-up is as necessary on the Democratic Republic of the Congo as it is on Sierra Leone.

Mr. Levitte (France) (*spoke in French*): The Ambassador of the United Kingdom has voiced my feelings very accurately. Our mission worked as a team without any differences of view among our seven members. That, to a large extent, is the result of the

personal efforts made by Ambassador Holbrooke, whom I wish to thank here.

The Security Council mission to Central Africa, of which I was honoured to be a part, was certainly busy and useful. It was busy because of our many different contacts with almost all the actors in the conflict. It was useful because it enabled us better to understand the suffering and hopes of the Congolese people and to assess the state of mind of the belligerents, to evaluate the expectations held of the United Nations and to contribute to the settlement of one problem — in Kisangani — that erupted while the mission was in the region.

The mission enabled us to make several findings. On that basis, we can see where we should focus our efforts over the coming weeks and months.

As to our findings, the mission's report faithfully describes the elements thereof. I should like to stress those that I feel to be the most noteworthy.

First, the Congolese people is suffering and profoundly weary of war and of its chaos, violence and devastation, the massive violation of human rights, the massacres in war and occupation zones, the plundering of natural resources, the total absence of law, order and the minimum basic services that citizens are entitled to expect of their authorities. Ambassador Greenstock spoke very eloquently of the situation in Kananga, which is just one example among many.

Secondly, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is now ready to cooperate fully with the United Nations and to facilitate the work of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). Clear commitments have been made in this respect. Evidence of that is the signing of the status-of-forces agreement in the presence of our mission.

Thirdly, third States involved in the conflict claim themselves ready to respect the ceasefire and the 8 April disengagement plan and to implement the Lusaka Agreement. Indeed, the ceasefire has been respected since 14 April. The only major incident has been the fighting that erupted in Kisangani on 5 May between Ugandan and Rwandan forces. The presence of the mission in the region allowed us to persuade those two countries to agree to disengage their forces and to demilitarize the city.

Fourthly, the people and all parties to the conflict are calling on the United Nations to shoulder its responsibilities without delay — in other words, rapidly to deploy MONUC.

On the basis of these findings, where should we focus our efforts? France has identified five main areas.

The first is the implementation of the military aspect of the Lusaka Agreement. This is the top priority. We must build on the basis of the ceasefire established on 14 April. This requires, first, that the parties, through the Joint Military Commission (JMC), implement the plans for disengagement, redeployment and, ultimately, withdrawal; and secondly, that phase II of MONUC be deployed as quickly as possible so as to be able to monitor respect for the ceasefire and the parties' implementation of the commitments they have made.

Specifically, this involves several tasks. First, MONUC and the JMC must be co-located pursuant to resolution 1291 (2000). Secondly, we must speed up preparations for deploying MONUC up to the level authorized by the Council. The United Nations can do nothing without commitment by Member States to provide the human, material and financial resources needed. For its part, France will contribute to the equipment and logistical support for one of the four battalions deployed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Thirdly, a special effort must be made in Kisangani, which, in accordance with the agreement between Uganda and Rwanda, is to be demilitarized and controlled by MONUC. This will require MONUC to be given the means necessary for the job. In our opinion, deployment must be progressive and proceed as resources become available so that we can consolidate the nascent peace dynamic where it is most urgent and delicate, especially in Kisangani.

Here, I would agree entirely with the statement made by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom. I believe it would be useful and urgent for the Secretariat to help us to define the resources — no doubt even greater than anticipated — in that large city of 2 million inhabitants, the third largest in the country. In this way, the United Nations, through MONUC, can assume this major responsibility identified by our mission, in addition to those originally defined in resolution 1291 (2000).

In order to carry out all of these operations, the United Nations is represented on the ground by two eminent individuals, Mr. Morjane, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and General Diallo, MONUC Commander. All of the parties now have confidence in them, and this attests to their outstanding personal and professional qualities, for which I commend them.

The second area where we must focus our efforts is the national dialogue. This is not only one of the fundamental elements of the Lusaka Agreement, it is also the way in which the Democratic Republic of the Congo can be given a democratic base, allowing the re-establishment of unity in the country, the achievement of national reconciliation and the rebuilding of the State. France supports the work of the facilitator, Mr. Masire, by providing him with political support and $700,000 in financial support. As is recommended in the report, we are in favour of swiftly appointing a high-level adviser to the facilitator, who would be based in Kinshasa and should be French speaking.

As for the venue, the report suggests that, first of all, one might consider Kisangani, which is centrally located in the country and which should be demilitarized and under United Nations control, pending a subsequent shift of the venue to Kinshasa for the national dialogue, in due course. We think this is a good proposal, and we believe it should be supported.

As regards the substance, the facilitator must make sure that the dialogue brings together all of the political forces, without giving preferential treatment to those that have taken up arms, and that it develops quickly, avoiding endless sterile dialogue. However, even though it is desirable that the internal political dialogue and the military provisions of the Lusaka Agreement proceed in parallel, it would be counterproductive to link the two processes too closely, because in the military situation — and we saw this just recently in Kisangani — there are developments that might be destabilizing and that have hardly any connection to the internal political issues in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The third area where we should focus our efforts is the establishment of a panel on the illegal exploitation of natural resources. Even before the mission left, the Council had taken a position of principle in favour of such a panel. The mission could not but note the importance of this problem and that it would be a good idea to clarify the situation. Therefore, without delay, we have to spell out the mandate of the panel and call on the Secretary-General to set it up. Tackling what feeds the war — and is sometimes the motivation for the war — is a prerequisite to the search for peace. The French delegation attaches special importance to this matter.

The fourth area where we should focus our efforts is mass violations of human rights and massacres. Information on this subject is piling up week after week. Just yesterday, Human Rights Watch issued a new report that we cannot fail to be affected by. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as elsewhere, impunity must not be tolerated. The Council must very quickly start thinking about ways and means of fact-finding and making sure that criminals are brought to justice.

The fifth and last area is disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of armed groups. This is certainly a very difficult matter, first of all because the facts are very difficult to establish. Of course, it is convenient to use just one single accusatory label for all the so-called non-signatory forces, but the situation is certainly more complex than this. But above and beyond the difficulty of establishing the facts, it is clear that there can be no viable lasting military solution. For years, many trained armies have been trying in vain to find a military solution.

Thus, the only reasonable approach involves two elements. First, all refugees, exiles and wanderers who at one time or another have seen recourse to arms as the only solution must be offered three kinds of prospects in their countries of origin: their physical security must be guaranteed, they must be given an economic option, and they must be reintegrated into political life in their country.

Secondly, those who are truly guilty of crimes of genocide must be brought to justice, as well as all of those who in the last four years in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have been guilty of crimes of war or crimes against humanity.

In conclusion, we are at a crucial moment in the evolution of this conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Some progress has been made, and we must consolidate that progress.

At the political level, first of all, we must maintain and support the dialogue that the Security

Council has now begun with the parties, first in January, on the initiative of Ambassador Holbrooke, and then this month with the Council mission. As the mission report notes, and as Ambassador Holbrooke pointed out, the French presidency of the Council in June will be organizing another meeting here in New York on 15 and 16 June, between the Council and the members of the Political Committee of the Lusaka Agreement. I will come back to the Council to provide further information on this once we get the details about the visit to New York by the members of the Political Committee.

The second area where we have to consolidate the progress of the peace process is at the military level. We must quickly give MONUC all the resources it needs so that it can be deployed on the ground. The credibility of the Council and of the United Nations as a whole is at stake.

On this point, I would like to stress once again what was said by the two preceding speakers, Ambassador Holbrooke and Ambassador Greenstock. Recent events in Sierra Leone certainly cast a shadow on all of the peacekeeping missions of the United Nations, particularly in Africa. But every crisis has its own particular features. We must of course draw all possible lessons from the Sierra Leone situation, but the lesson we draw for the Democratic Republic of the Congo is that the Sierra Leone situation must lead us to redouble our efforts here and to make our commitment in the Democratic Republic of the Congo a success achieved by the United Nations — in other words, a success achieved by all of us.

Mr. Ben Mustapha (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): First of all I would like to thank the head of our mission, Ambassador Holbrooke, for his briefing on the Security Council mission's visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and I would like to take this opportunity to express to him our appreciation for the leadership, wisdom and dynamism he demonstrated in the course of the visit. He thus enabled the mission to carry out the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council.

The Council's decision to send a mission to the region reflects the importance that it attaches to settling the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It also demonstrates the Council's desire to actively oversee the implementation of its resolutions.

Like all the other members of the Council who took part in the mission, my delegation endorses the observations and recommendations contained in the report of the mission. We believe that they deserve the full attention of the Security Council, the membership of the United Nations and the Secretariat. I would like to focus on a few points.

The visit made it possible to engage in direct dialogue with the parties on the implementation of resolution 1291 (2000) and the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. We urged the parties to choose peace and stressed their obligations in this regard, but we also took into consideration their expectations and concerns.

We heard positive and encouraging words from the leaders whom we met. President Kabila shared with us his Government's devotion to peace and his desire to give full support and cooperation to efforts under way to restore peace.

The ceasefire established in the agreement reached by the parties on 8 April in Kampala is a step forward on the path to peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but as yet it is fragile. The military developments that occurred in Kisangani and around the town during the mission's visit show the precariousness of the situation. As Ambassador Holbrooke said, the Council's mission made an active contribution to defusing the situation in Kisangani. We believe that during this decisive stage additional efforts at the political and military levels on the part of the parties, as well as constant and active support and follow-up on the part of the international community, are necessary.

We welcome the fact that all of the parties have emphasized the urgent need for the rapid deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) so as to avoid any vacuum that might imperil the ceasefire. Clearly such a deployment requires firm commitment on the part of all the parties. As a beginning, the signing of the status-of-forces agreement between MONUC and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the presence of the Security Council mission, was significant.

Both President Kabila and the other Congolese parties and members of Congolese civil society that we met in Kinshasa reiterated their support for the inter-Congolese dialogue. We hope that the persisting

differences — in particular with regard to the venue of the dialogue — will be eliminated as soon as possible so that dialogue can commence on a solid basis. We call upon the Congolese parties to fully cooperate with the facilitator. We have already noted that the broad majority of interlocutors prefer that the dialogue take place on Congolese territory.

I would like to emphasize, as the report does, that, as regards the promotion of lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, there is a close connection between progress in the inter-Congolese dialogue, deployment of MONUC and the implementation of other military aspects of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement.

Another issue our mission took up was the exchange of prisoners of war. Beyond the humanitarian dimension, this exchange would contribute to promoting trust among the parties. We welcome the positive reaction of all the parties to this issue. We believe follow-up should be carried out with the assistance of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) so that this expressed determination will be converted into actions as soon as possible.

Among the other questions that the mission raised with the parties was the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The mission recommends that the Council rapidly set up the group of experts whose establishment it has been considering. We expect the Council to reach a decision on this subject very soon.

The visit of the Security Council mission made it possible to begin a constructive dialogue with the parties that is worth sustaining. The proposal to convene the Political Committee in New York, under the Council presidency of Ambassador Jean-David Levitte, in June, would provide a new opportunity to continue this dialogue with a view to yet further supporting the peace process.

In conclusion, I, too, would like to pay tribute to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to the Force Commander, Major General Diallo, and to all the MONUC staff for their tireless efforts to ensure the success of MONUC.

Mr. Yel'chenko (Ukraine): Like my colleagues who have already spoken, I would like to pay tribute to Ambassador Holbrooke for his leadership and determination as the head of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This mission coincided with very dangerous developments on the African continent.

As we all know, the Security Council started its work in the year 2000 with an affirmation of its commitment to conflict resolution in Africa. Today the Council is going through another "month of Africa", which has put this commitment to a difficult and demanding test.

It is from this perspective that we would like to express our appreciation to the members of the mission for their important contribution to redeeming the Council's pledge to meet this test. Ukraine has endorsed all the observations and recommendations contained in the report prepared by the mission. I would like to make a few comments with regard to some of the major issues raised in the report.

My first point relates to the issue of the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). The results of the talks of the Security Council mission's members with the leaders of the parties to the Lusaka Agreement have reconfirmed the urgency of the deployment of phase II of MONUC. In this connection, we agree entirely that one of the most compelling tasks today is to prevent the developments in Sierra Leone from having any negative impact on the United Nations presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Certainly, it is not enough simply to say that the peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be judged on its own merits. We have to admit that potential MONUC troop contributors will take into account the current crisis in Sierra Leone. We have to acknowledge that their judgement will also be based on the United Nations response to the developments in Sierra Leone and on the successful outcome of the United Nations actions to overcome the crisis.

We agree with the mission's recommendation that the Secretary-General's final decision on MONUC deployment should be preceded by a reaffirmation by all parties of their commitment to the Lusaka Agreement. At the same time, we would also urge the Secretary-General to pay particular attention to increasing MONUC's capabilities to protect its personnel. The military strength of the expanded MONUC has to be strong enough to produce a real

restraining effect on any attempts to threaten the safety and security of peacekeepers.

The mission's report also underscores another point, which has to be addressed directly to the parties to the Lusaka Agreement. To be successful, the peace process has to move forward. The new attitude of the parties towards maintaining the ceasefire, noted in the mission report, is indeed encouraging. At the same time, the ceasefire is only one component of the Lusaka Agreement. In this context, the parties have to demonstrate more responsibility in advancing all other integral parts of the peace process.

For example, we recognize that the differences over the venue of the inter-Congolese dialogue are considerable. However, they do not amount to the major obstacle to the launching of the inter-Congolese political talks, which are so fundamental to achieving lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

In this connection, we fully support the initiative of France to convene a meeting of the Political Committee next month in New York; this might resolve some of the outstanding questions impeding progress in the peace process. We agree that more difficult issues, such as the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement of the armed groups, should also be taken up during that meeting of the Political Committee in New York.

It is also important to acknowledge the instrumental role played by the Security Council mission in defusing the Kisangani crisis, which recalled the times of the struggle for territories in Africa and was even labeled the Fashoda of the twenty-first century. The fighting in this Congolese city should encourage the Security Council to take a stronger position on the need to put an end to the presence of foreign troops in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which is inconsistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter. We take note of the agreement between Rwanda and Uganda to withdraw their forces from Kisangani.

Before concluding, I would like to place special emphasis on the mission's recommendation for the early establishment of an expert panel to investigate the reports of the illegal exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It should be recalled that the Security Council has already formally undertaken to take a decision on this matter expeditiously, taking into account the conclusions of its mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Finally, we, like the French delegation, are very much concerned about the human rights situation in the eastern Congo, which is proving to be really disastrous, according to a number of reliable reports. The Security Council should pay special attention to this issue. In our view, a panel should be set up for the purpose of investigating the reports on flagrant human rights violations and atrocities perpetrated against the civilian population in the eastern Congo.

The **President** (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Rwanda, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mutaboba (Rwanda) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

Mr. **Mohammad Kamal** (Malaysia): My delegation would like to join in thanking Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, not only for presenting the report of the Security Council mission's visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but also for his outstanding leadership of this important mission. We commend him and the other mission members for helping to improve the Council's understanding of the challenges that the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) faces there.

The civil war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a key link in the chain of interconnected conflicts that are ravaging a vast swathe of Africa. No fewer than six countries and three rebel factions have been drawn into the struggle in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which also includes militias and profiteers more motivated by the desire to exploit that country's natural resources than anything else. Thousands of civilians have been killed, and many more are dying from disease and hunger. Nearly a million Congolese have been displaced from their

homes. The recent fighting in Kisangani, which violated the Lusaka Agreement, the disengagement agreement signed at Kampala on 8 April and the 14 April ceasefire, is indeed a setback to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

We agree with Ambassador Holbrooke that the setbacks that have occurred should not deter us. The international community cannot abandon the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Doing so will only send the wrong message to Africa.

There is, of course, reason to be wary of another potentially dangerous United Nations peacekeeping operation in one of the most intractable war zones, but this operation reflects the growing consensus by the combatants themselves that it is in their own interests to abide by a peace Agreement that was signed last July. If an environment safe enough for peacekeepers can be established, the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers deserves support. We noted that each of the five central and southern African Presidents consulted during the mission's trip was unequivocal in his appeal for rapid deployment and apprehensive about the sustainability of the ceasefire without it. There is no doubt that the leaders of the region have to share responsibility for returning the Democratic Republic of the Congo to stability. Consequently, my delegation fully shares the recommendation that the Secretary-General, before making his final decision, should speak to each of the Lusaka parties at the highest level, seeking their unequivocal commitment to assist the deployment of phase II of MONUC and securing their continued commitment to the maintenance of the ceasefire and their firm undertaking to support phase II on the ground in every way possible.

The Lusaka Agreement is intended to lead to an immediate ceasefire and an inter-Congolese dialogue on the country's future. All sides continue to violate the Agreement, but large parts of the country are substantially at peace. MONUC would not interpose itself between active combatants; rather, it would provide security in relatively stable zones, which would allow observers to document violations of the Lusaka Agreement there. The aim is to reduce security fears on all sides and build confidence that would enable the parties themselves to expand peaceful areas and address the more intractable issues.

Chief among these issues is the problem of how to neutralize the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces and the Interhamwe militia, an essential element in restoring confidence in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. My delegation concurs with the mission's suggestion that unless this is resolved, it will be very difficult to restore the rule of law or to ensure the security of borders in the eastern part of that country. We agree that any successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme requires an end to support for all non-State militias, the peaceful reintegration of such fighters from neighbouring States into their countries of origin and the commitment by the international community to assist in this process.

We express our support to France for its intention to invite the Political Committee to meet in New York during the French presidency in June.

The experiences of Somalia and Rwanda have shown the disastrous potential of poorly conceived, ill-defined operations that lack the military and financial means to do the job.

As in Sierra Leone or elsewhere in Africa, the international community is at a crossroads in terms of how to respond in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Peacekeepers everywhere know that even the best-prepared ceasefire sometimes breaks down. Moreover, the crisis in Sierra Leone should not be allowed to cloud the international community's responsibility for helping to bring peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the same time, we would like to emphasize the need to avoid repeating similar mistakes in other missions, including the one in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has its own unique characteristics, and the peacekeeping operation there must be judged on its own merits.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): We would like to join our colleagues in paying high tribute to Ambassador Holbrooke for his leadership of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He brought the Council's authority to bear with his well-known diplomatic skills, tenacity, determination and power of persuasion upon the leaders of the nations involved. We are deeply grateful to him for the service he rendered to the Security Council and for the contribution he has made to the cause of peace.

We appreciate Ambassador Holbrooke's introduction of the report this morning, giving us the mission's insights into the real issues and challenges born of first-hand experience and an assessment of the situation. We are grateful to you, Mr. President, for arranging this open debate for considering the report of the mission. We recall our regret that the report of the Council mission to Kosovo could not be held in a format allowing participation of even the most deeply involved Members of the United Nations.

My delegation would also like to express sincerest thanks to the members of the mission for the role they played in their individual capacities and as members of the mission. Theirs was an enormously difficult mission, complicated by the rapidly deteriorating situation in Sierra Leone and preparations for war between Eritrea and Ethiopia. The mission's intervention yielded immediate results, as evidenced by the conclusion of the status-of-forces agreement and by the joint declaration on the demilitarization of Kisangani.

We shall limit our intervention to five issues. The most immediate question in our mind is the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). As the mission reports, the same concern is shared by the leaders in the region. Drawing lessons from the Sierra Leone experience, the mission advises caution against deployment before a conflict has run its course. The mission also recommends that we should be assured of the security of peacekeepers and immediate availability of reinforcements. We are obviously confronted with two opposing considerations: on the one hand, the expediency of deployment of MONUC for maintaining the peace process, and on the other hand, the imperative of security for peacekeepers and avoiding humiliation.

In this connection, we should like to recall Bangladesh's offer to provide one infantry battalion to MONUC. We have not hesitated to maintain our offer for the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), even in the midst of recent developments. We remain firm in our commitment to MONUC.

We believe in the complementarity of our collective efforts. We contribute to the cause of peace with what is at our disposal. Nations willing to contribute their men but not having the capacity to furnish materiél should have their contribution complemented by countries that can provide equipment and other logistic and technical support. This will make our collective security efforts collective in the real sense.

Related to the deployment of MONUC is the issue of its functioning with the Joint Military Commission (JMC). It is disappointing to note that some members of the JMC refuse even to meet in Kinshasa, while the Council, in its resolution 1291 (2000), provided for co-location of MONUC and JMC.

The second question I would address is disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement. We endorse the view that all armed groups, including the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces and Interahamwe, must commit themselves to the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement process. This issue remains at the heart of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and has implications for peace and stability in the Great Lakes region.

The third issue we would comment on is the inter-Congolese dialogue. We share the view that the dialogue should be in conjunction with the deployment of MONUC and the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement process. The lack of agreement on the issue is disconcerting. We are confident Sir Ketumile Masire will be able to work out a consensus among the parties at an early date.

Fourth is the question of respect for humanitarian law and human rights. We are grateful to Ambassador van Walsum for raising the issue during the mission's visit. The Mwenga incident is particularly abhorrent, and the response of Mr. Ilunga is outrageous. This shows the long-term consequences of impunity. We agree that the Mwenga incident, because of the particularly grotesque nature of the crime, should be investigated in the first place. We also agree that all cases of violation of humanitarian law and gross violation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be investigated and that those responsible must be prosecuted. The release of prisoners of war is a humanitarian priority. We call upon all concerned to proceed quickly to release prisoners of war under the aegis of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The fifth and final point we would like to address is the setting up of an expert panel on the illegal

exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. When the draft reply to the Secretary-General was discussed, views were expressed in favour of a decision after the return of the mission from the country. My delegation would support the establishment of the panel as outlined by the Secretary-General, now that the mission is back and has made recommendations in favour of an early establishment.

We hope the Council and the Secretariat will have the occasion to exchange views with the Political Committee on all these issues during its proposed visit to the United Nations in June.

Here we would like to support the recommendation made by the United Kingdom for immediate attention to Kisangani. We too would request the Secretariat to make an assessment on a priority basis for rapid deployment of required MONUC contingents in that area without any loss of time.

Finally, the chances for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the area will depend on the leaders of the region. We believe they have control over the armed groups. We also believe they can commit these groups to the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement process and ensure full cooperation with the United Nations, allowing early deployment of phase II of MONUC. They can give the required assurances in their discussion with the Secretary-General, as recommended by the mission.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation has carefully studied the report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that visited the region of this conflict from 4 to 8 May 2000. We join in the positive assessment of the work by members of the mission under the leadership of Ambassador Holbrooke in pursuance of the Security Council mandate.

The main outcome of the mission, in our view, is the confirmation by all parties to the conflict of their commitment to settling the conflict by peaceful means on the basis of the Lusaka Agreement. It is encouraging that the ceasefire agreement is being respected by all parties so far.

Against that background, we are particularly concerned over the clashes that occurred on 8 May in Kisangani between the Ugandan and the Rwandan forces. In our opinion, the argument that fighting using that kind of artillery, as a result of which about 100 Congolese civilians were wounded, is not strictly speaking a violation of the ceasefire in our opinion is faint consolation, for such incidents at any point could lead to the resumption of fighting on a broad scale throughout the country. We attach priority importance to swift implementation of the agreements between the Ugandan leadership and the Rwandan leadership on the demilitarization of Kisangani.

Respect for the ceasefire, the signing with the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo of the status-of-forces agreement, and the desire — seen in contacts with the Security Council mission — of all those involved in the conflict for swift deployment of phase II of MONUC must be accomplished in practice.

We agree with the mission's view that developments in Sierra Leone should not be allowed to cloud the international community's responsibility to assist in the settlement of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the same time, we fully support the mission's recommendation that before the appropriate decision is taken the Secretary-General should speak once again to each of the Lusaka parties, at the highest level, with regard to assisting deployment of peacekeeping forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

At all stages of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Russia has believed that an integral part of efforts to find a settlement must be the settling of the problem of the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement of members of armed groups, including the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces and the Interahamwe militia. We have always said that this question must be resolved peacefully and voluntarily. Detailed discussion of this matter, together with members of the Political Committee in mid-June, as is being proposed by Ambassador Levitte, could help us to move ahead in finding a solution.

Another key condition for finding a settlement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is the holding — pursuant to the Lusaka Agreement — of the inter-Congolese national dialogue. We regard the start of this

broad dialogue about the future of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as one of the most important tasks. We understand the desire of most of the parties to hold the dialogue in Congolese territory, whether it be in the capital or elsewhere. We think this question can be resolved by the Congolese parties themselves, with the participation of the international facilitator of the inter-Congolese national dialogue, the former President of Botswana, Mr. Masire.

In conclusion, I would hope that our united efforts will succeed in achieving the restoration of peace to the long-suffering land of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that the recommendations of the mission will help to that end.

Mr. Fowler (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Canada welcomes the report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We thank the members of the delegation for their work on behalf of peace in that country and hope that their practical expression of the commitment of the Security Council to the region will encourage an equally genuine sense of engagement by the signatories to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreements.

We believe that the timing of this mission was critical. While the disengagement agreement signed on 8 April has largely held, the eruption of armed hostilities in Kisangani on 5 May, in which large numbers of civilians were killed, demonstrates that the vigilance of the Council remains necessary and that without it much can still be lost. In this case the delegation moved quickly and was a crucial factor in getting the parties to acknowledge the need for a mechanism to reduce their military exposure. On 8 May we witnessed the fruit of this labour in the commitment by Rwanda and Uganda to demilitarize Kisangani and its surroundings.

(*spoke in English*)

Much work remains to be done before confidence can truly be said to exist among the signatories to the Lusaka Agreement. We commend this mission for seizing the parties of the need to agree on a venue for the Joint Military Commission and for the inter-Congolese dialogue, the latter being of particular interest to Canada. As a financial supporter of the inter-Congolese dialogue process, we are impressed by the resolve of the Congolese people to establish a democratic political structure and to develop institutions conducive to good governance, just as we are impressed by the demand of civil society for a viable political track to displace the disfunctional military option. We thank the delegation for its efforts to move the parties towards consensus on these issues, and we encourage those who have pledged funds in support of the inter-Congolese dialogue process to make this funding available to the facilitator as soon as possible.

Canada also appreciates the mission's efforts to harmonize relations between the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as demonstrated by the signing of the status-of-forces agreement on 4 May. The removal of administrative obstacles — for example, surrounding the issue of MONUC flight clearances — will facilitate the process of insuring the ability of MONUC to work effectively. We note that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has yet to offer firm and credible guarantees, however, on the freedom of movement of United Nations personnel within the country and on stable and non-extortionary exchange-rate mechanisms.

Canada remains gravely concerned by the humanitarian situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which continues to deteriorate despite the parties' commitment to the disengagement agreement. While we are encouraged that the mission was able to secure consensus on the need to proceed with the release of prisoners of war, we are disappointed that the parties were not more forthcoming with respect to assurances of improved humanitarian access. We also note that the delegation found unacceptable many of the parties' justifications for the high incidence of human rights abuses, which have so far been committed with utter impunity. We urge Member States to ensure that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights field office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo receives appropriate funding and resources, and to ensure that human rights violators are indeed held accountable.

This issue is of great concern to Canada, because we do not believe that the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as currently planned has the capacity to ensure or even verify compliance with relevant provisions of international human rights and humanitarian law. In fact, in light of developments in Sierra Leone, we are more concerned

than ever that MONUC does not have the capacity to achieve even the core elements of its mandate.

As we stated in February, the resolution authorizing phase II of MONUC falls perilously short of matching the Mission's mandate with the resources needed for its success. Canada has long argued that an adequate match between mandate and resources is not an option but an operational necessity. Surely it is time to learn and absorb this lesson. The recent events in Sierra Leone, the parallels of which cannot be wished away, have reinforced our conviction that short-changing United Nations peacekeeping missions in terms of quantity or operational capability or of quality is indeed penny-wise and pound-foolish. More than that, it is an abdication of the fundamental responsibilities that are incumbent upon every Member State of this Organization, responsibility to the soldiers who serve in our names and responsibility to nurture and uphold the reputation and effectiveness of this Organization — responsibilities for which the members of the Security Council are directly accountable. Recent developments in Sierra Leone have demonstrated dramatically the imperative of the United Nations deploying capable and well-trained troops that are fully equipped from the moment of their arrival in theatre.

While the responsibilities of the Council and of the Secretariat are evident and important, those of the parties to this conflict are paramount. We reiterate our call on the parties to fulfil, in letter and in spirit, their obligations under Lusaka and subsequent agreements. Without such a commitment to pursue peace, the necessary conditions for an effective United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will necessarily elude us.

There is a human security disaster unfolding in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that requires immediate action. As Council members, our responsibility is to make certain that MONUC has the necessary resources to be more than a passive witness, while also ensuring its own safety. We should review carefully and soon the current plans and parameters for MONUC in this light.

We thank the delegation we sent to the Democratic Republic of the Congo for drawing the international community's attention to the importance of considering the situation in that country on its own merits. It is precisely because of the unique complexity and delicacy of the current situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that we wish to emphasize the relevance of what has occurred in Sierra Leone. We should approach the significant challenges awaiting the United Nations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo with very clear eyes and well prepared for the worst.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be joined at this table this morning by a pre-eminent Canadian diplomat and statesman, The Honourable Mitchell Sharp, who has served his country in many capacities as public servant and Minister, including, as my first boss in the 1960s, as Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am glad he could be with us today.

Mr. Andjaba (Namibia): Let me take this opportunity to commend my dear friend and colleague Ambassador Holbrooke for the outstanding leadership he provided to the mission. His steadfastness, firmness and ability to persuade contributed immensely to the success of the mission. I also wish to thank Ambassador Holbrooke for introducing the report and for the comments he has made on the mission's activities while in the region. In addition to the points that he has made, I wish to emphasize some points that are of importance to my delegation.

It is true that all the mission's interlocutors urged the deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) as soon as possible. Naturally, Namibia shares the same view. The 14 April ceasefire agreement continues to hold and the status-of-forces agreement has been signed. These two very important factors alone have paved the way for deployment of the 5,500 military observers. Any further delay of the arrival of the military observers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo might be misinterpreted and taken advantage of by the enemies of peace in the Congo. This time, we cannot fail the people of the Congo. Resolution 1291 (2000) has put the responsibility for the deployment of military observers entirely on the Secretary-General. We therefore urge him to bring the initial deployment timetable forward and to deploy the observers to the Democratic Republic of the Congo without further delay.

Furthermore, we wish to express our appreciation to those Member States that have offered to contribute their troops to MONUC.

The inter-Congolese dialogue is no doubt one of the important pillars of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Namibia supports the early holding of such a dialogue and we encourage the facilitator to continue to work with all Congolese to resolve the outstanding issues, thus paving the way for the early holding of the dialogue. In this regard, we urge all Congolese parties to work together and cooperate with the facilitator to find a mutually acceptable venue.

On 25 April, in this Chamber, the facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue presented his work plan for the dialogue and outlined the difficulties he was experiencing, including the lack of human and material resources. We therefore renew our call for contributions and technical assistance to bolster the efforts of the facilitator and to give the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo a chance to succeed.

Now that the ceasefire is holding, the time has come for the exchange of all prisoners of war, as provided for in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. We therefore insist that those parties holding prisoners of war cooperate with the International Committee of the Red Cross to secure the release of such prisoners.

We remain gravely concerned at the reports of human rights violations in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The recent May 2000 report of the Human Rights Watch, entitled "Eastern Congo Ravaged: Killing Civilians and Silencing Protest", documents in graphic, grim detail war crimes being committed against civilians in the east. The report only confirms media reports about the most horrendous atrocities. The systematic rape of women and girls in the east must stop. The 15 Congolese women who were buried alive in the east should not be forgotten. Their cries should echo the call for immediate deployment of the United Nations observers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to assist in the process for peace, stability and development in that country.

We call on the rebels and their supporters to cease terrorizing the civilian population of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This situation demands immediate action and it is imperative that those responsible be held accountable for their actions. While on this critical issue, let me pay tribute to the United Nations agencies for their crucial work in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in addressing the desperate humanitarian situation of the Congolese people. Furthermore, I also wish to thank the non-governmental organizations for their contribution in this regard.

There is no doubt that the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is helping to finance the ongoing war. This illegal exploitation is taking place in violation of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and resolution 1291 (2000) and should not be allowed to continue. The mission has recommended the early establishment of an expert panel to take this matter forward, in concurrence with an earlier proposal by the Secretary-General. We fully support this proposal and are ready to consider a formal decision on this burning matter.

The resumption of fighting between Ugandan and Rwandese troops in Kisangani on 5 May is most deplorable. It is acceptable neither that foreign forces wage war against each other on foreign territory, nor that they invade another country. The resumed fighting has resulted in the deaths and injury of innocent Congolese civilians. Worse still, those who inflicted the damage and caused death do not seem to be remorseful about it. We look forward to the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the forces of Uganda and Rwanda, as committed in the agreement between the two countries.

In conclusion, let me pay special tribute to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Morjane, to the Force Commander of MONUC, General Diallo, and to the men and women of MONUC for their tireless efforts in carrying out their mandate under difficult conditions.

Mr. Ag Oumar (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I join preceding speakers in thanking not only you, Mr. President, for organizing this open meeting on the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but also Ambassador Richard Holbrooke for introducing the report to us and for his leadership of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As is usual for him, he led it most ably and with great knowledge of the situation. My delegation thanks him for that. In January, he focused his presidency of the Security Council on Africa, and now, by the nature of things, China's presidency in this month of May again has a lot of work to do on Africa, even though all these meetings on Africa were not on

the schedule. I should like to say to Ambassador Holbrooke that Africa remembers the commitments he made in January and that he must not rest until all those commitments are implemented.

Having said this, however, my delegation is very pleased with the positive outcome of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Kisangani incident and the violations in the Equateur Province are indeed deplorable, but my delegation considers that this was not a rupture between the parties to the conflict, but they do need to be followed up urgently. The response to the main issues raised by the Security Council mission enables us to say today that we are in a new and positive situation, and it is urgently necessary now to implement phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC).

The deployment of phase II of MONUC is no longer just something we would like to happen, but rather an imperative for all of the signatories to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and, indeed, for all of Africa, despite the lessons that can be drawn from the tragedy in Sierra Leone, which my delegation deeply deplores. It is our view that the problem of disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement of the armed groups is an essential element for re-establishing confidence in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and for putting an end to the many violations of human rights. We fully support the recommendations to the Secretary-General on the deployment of phase II of MONUC.

In the recent past, Mali itself witnessed how beneficial a national dialogue can be, which is why we are glad that the signatories to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and representatives of civil society, political parties and the church are all aware of the urgent need for the inter-Congolese dialogue. It is our ardent hope that the parties will very soon reach agreement on the venue where the dialogue is to take place so that it can start as soon as possible; because without a political option, there is a real danger that the parties might focus exclusively on the military option. We commend the efforts made by Sir Ketumile Masire in his work as facilitator.

My delegation supports the appointment of a high-level, French-speaking adviser to the facilitator who would be based in Kinshasa, as the report before us today recommends. My delegation welcomes the idea of a new meeting in June, under the French presidency, of members of the Political Committee of the Lusaka Agreement and the Security Council, with a view to continuing the dialogue among the parties and giving it a new impetus. This would help not only the Security Council, but also the parties.

Mr. Cappagli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this open debate, which makes it possible for the entire membership of the United Nations to participate. Their opinions will assist us in our consideration of the topic before us. We join previous speakers in thanking the Permanent Representative of the United States and head of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, for his very enlightening words, which complement the written report that has been distributed to us. We also thank most sincerely Ambassadors Levitte, Ouane, Andjaba, van Walsum, Ben Mustapha and Greenstock for their great personal efforts.

These are difficult times for the United Nations in Africa. The conflicts in Sierra Leone, Eritrea/Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, just to mention the most urgent ones, are testing our capability to respond. Sending the mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and then to Ethiopia and Eritrea is in and of itself a very important sign. We cannot skimp on resources in this situation, which demands all our effort and imagination so that we can find appropriate solutions. The mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a demonstration of the kind of response that we must give. The detailed report submitted to us today reaffirms our conviction that we can and must redouble our efforts to deal with a delicate situation in an equally delicate regional context.

In the mandate we gave to the mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we were clear. There is no doubt whatsoever that the mission fully discharged that mandate. It had direct contact with the protagonists and emphasized to them the imperative that they strictly abide by the ceasefire, with a view to reaching speedy and full implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and resolution 1291 (2000). We agree with the observations and recommendations put forward and

would like to touch upon some points that we think are important.

First, the report makes it evident that there is a consensus among the parties on the need to implement phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), as provided in resolution 1291 (2000). There is no doubt that this is essential in order to make progress in the peace process and thus we are hopeful that the conditions established in the resolution will be created so that the Secretary-General can recommend the speedy deployment of personnel.

The joint declaration of Rwanda and Uganda on the demilitarization of Kisangani, which was reached through the mediation of the mission, is doubtless a demonstration of this consensus. We regret that after the declaration was made, military confrontations took place, and we hope that these were merely isolated events that will not be repeated.

Another essential aspect for making progress in the peace process is the inter-Congolese dialogue. In this connection we reiterate our support for the facilitator of that dialogue, the former President of Botswana, Sir Ketumile Masire. We hope he will be able to overcome the difficulties that exist with regard to the current plan of work.

We would like to reiterate our concern about the consequences of this conflict for the civilian population. We deeply regret that there were innocent civilian victims of the recent confrontations in Kisangani. We are also alarmed by what was said in paragraph 51 of the report regarding the incidents in Mwenga. These incidents must be investigated, and the perpetrators of these truly grotesque acts must be punished.

We would like to support the proposal of holding a meeting in New York this June of the Council and the Political Committee. We believe that this is a positive step that would surely help with the implementation of the peace process. Finally, we also support the recommendation of the mission for the Security Council to rapidly establish an expert group to consider the question of the illegal exploitation of natural resources.

We believe that the conclusions of this report are clear, and they give us the hope that progress can be made in the speedy implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and of Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 1291 (2000).

By way of conclusion, we would like to reiterate our commitment to the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to Africa. We must not let recent events in the region undermine our efforts.

Miss Durrant (Jamaica): Today's open meeting on the report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a clear expression of the Security Council's commitment to reinvigorating the process of peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Only last week, the Security Council had the opportunity to critically assess the progress of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo, following the dispatch of a similar mission. It is obvious that these missions are effective in creating a better understanding of issues before the Council and in facilitating its decision-making.

It is against this background that my delegation commends the members of the mission for their instructive findings and Ambassador Holbrooke for his leadership of the mission. The Jamaican delegation welcomes the mission's analysis and recommendations, which will inform the Council's actions on the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The report is comprehensive, addressing, inter alia, the military and security situation, the inter-Congolese dialogue, cooperation between the Democratic Republic of the Congo Government and the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), as well as human rights and humanitarian issues. I will therefore confine my comments to some of the issues raised in the report to which my delegation attaches importance.

First, the tone of the report is guardedly optimistic. Significant events include the signing of the status-of-forces agreement on 4 May, the proposed timetable for the withdrawal of Rwandan and Ugandan troops from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the ceasefire agreement of 8 April. We are mindful, however, that peace remains fragile.

Secondly, we are pleased that the mission was able to meet with a wide cross-section of Congolese society, including members of civil society, religious leaders and leaders of political parties. The points of view they expressed in the meetings with the members

of the mission served to underscore the clear desire of the Congolese people for peace.

In this regard, the holding of the inter-Congolese dialogue is of paramount importance. The report cites numerous instances of discussions on the issue among various parties, noting, however, the divergent views on the venue. We note that there appears a greater degree of understanding between the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue, which we hope will augur well for the dialogue's success. Indeed, without a political track, all parties will inevitably focus on the military track. This would have tragic consequences for the long-suffering people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Security Council, for its part, must continue to send a strong message of support for the facilitator of the dialogue, Sir Ketumile Masire. We concur with the proposal made in the report that the facilitator, with the assistance of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the active backing of the Security Council, could address the issue of the venue in the first stages of the dialogue.

Thirdly, the readiness of some armed groups to engage in dialogue with the mission must be seen as a sign of hope for the future. My delegation notes, however, that the leader of the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo (MLC), Jean-Pierre Bemba, did not meet with the members of the mission, due reportedly to logistical difficulties. My delegation wishes to emphasize that compliance by all armed groups with the Lusaka Agreement is a sine qua non for its successful implementation. It is also encouraging that all the parties to the conflict demonstrated their desire to achieve sustainable peace, and they appealed for rapid deployment of phase II of MONUC.

My delegation, in supporting the rapid deployment of MONUC, wishes to emphasize that the Mission must be equipped to deal with any eventuality. There is also a need for all parties to provide credible security guarantees to enable MONUC to fulfil its mandate to monitor the ceasefire and to ensure that life-saving humanitarian assistance reaches the civilian population throughout the country.

At the same time, mechanisms must be put in place to address the issues relating to refugees and internally displaced persons. We wish to join the Permanent Representative of Namibia in calling for swift investigation of reported violations of human rights. My delegation was particularly appalled by the response of Mr. Ilunga, cited in paragraph 51 of the report, regarding the incident in Mwenga in which 15 women were reportedly buried alive.

My delegation remains concerned that the issue of co-location of MONUC and the Joint Military Commission (JMC) continues to be a source of contention. We also note that the report supports the view that the core structure for ceasefire monitoring, as outlined in resolution 1291 (2000), has to involve MONUC and the JMC working jointly from a co-located headquarters. We believe that the coordination of the activities of MONUC and the JMC is a functional one, and that every effort should be made to resolve the problem of location. Given the crucial role assigned to the JMC in the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement, we firmly believe that it must be provided with the resources to support its operations.

The process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants must be speeded up. The report observes that there is a rough, provisional figure of some 15,000 members of armed groups which still exist, but that the members of these groups are very hard to identify. There is obviously considerable work to be done if the ceasefire is to hold. Also, the proliferation of arms and access to arms by the populations throughout the Democratic Republic of the Congo will continue to undermine the peace process and inevitably perpetuate the cycle of conflict. We wish to support the initiative taken by France to invite the Political Committee to meet in New York in June, and we are sure that this will in no doubt serve as a stimulus to the peace process.

In our view, the Council also needs urgently to address the establishment of the panels on illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As we have said on other occasions, the illegal exploitation of minerals throughout Africa is a cause of severe conflict and, in fact, is providing the resources for continuing conflict.

Finally, my delegation joins in paying tribute to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the Force Commander and the men and women of MONUC for their work under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. van Walsum (Netherlands): My delegation, too, is grateful to Ambassador Holbrooke for his presentation of the mission's report, and I personally share his enthusiasm about the effective functioning of the mission. It has pointed out by other speakers that his style of leadership was largely responsible for that.

I heard Ambassador Holbrooke describe the mission as "three members from Africa, three from the European Union and one from the United States". There are, of course, other ways of looking at this; last Friday, I described the mission as "three from Africa, three from the P-5 and one from the Netherlands".

It is easy to find arguments for not going into the Congo. At a time when United Nations peacekeepers are taken hostage by rebels at one end of Africa, and a Security Council mission fails to prevent the outbreak of a full-scale war at the other end, the idea of deploying another peace operation in the heart of that troubled continent can easily be depicted as a hare-brained plan. The arguments against such an operation are valid and should be taken seriously. It is, in fact, somewhat disconcerting that so few of them have been heard in this morning's debate.

But, in the end, my delegation believes that all these arguments are overruled by the more compelling argument that the United Nations cannot afford simply to leave the Democratic Republic of the Congo to its fate. That country is one of the largest and potentially one of the wealthiest countries in Africa and lies in the very centre of the continent. The presence within its borders of the armies, invited or uninvited, of five other African countries evidently affects its national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Obviously, in such a huge country the deployment of 500 observers protected by 5,000 troops would indeed be a hare-brained operation if we were dealing with a fierce and bitter war between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its Southern African Development Community (SADC) allies on the one hand, and Rwanda and Uganda on the other, and if the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo II (MONUC II) was devised as an inter-position force. But that is not the case. The most important conclusion drawn by our mission is that all the forces want to disengage, and each of the five Presidents consulted by us was unequivocal in his appeal for a rapid deployment of MONUC II.

The argument that the Democratic Republic of the Congo is too big and MONUC II too small has clearly become less persuasive since the coming into force on 14 April of the ceasefire cum disengagement plan, which generally seems to be holding. A strip of land even as narrow as 30 kilometres, running right through the country, would be manageable from a military observer mission's point of view. Such a demarcation zone, however, should also serve as a warning to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to the international community that disengagement cannot be the end of our involvement. With MONUC II we will not be able to put an end to all the bloodshed, but our focus should be on the preservation of the Congo's territorial integrity.

One of the first decisions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was not to tamper with the existing borders. This decision bespoke great wisdom at the time, for what would have been more natural for the newly independent African States than to want to revise their borders, which had been arbitrarily drawn by their former colonial masters. This is not just a matter for Africa; the entire international community has a duty to honour this African wisdom.

This is why disengagement is not enough but must be followed by withdrawal. It was made very clear to our mission that a solution to the problem of the armed groups is a prerequisite condition for this withdrawal. Without such a solution, we cannot simply move the demarcation line to the eastern border and call it MONUC III, and with it, such an operation will not be necessary. This is why the Lusaka signatories must find a common solution to the problem of the armed groups.

If we focus too much on military solutions, however, we tend to overlook another condition for preserving the Congo's territorial integrity, and that is the successful implementation of the inter-Congolese dialogue. We fervently hope that no one in Kinshasa may be tempted to believe that the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement is an à la carte menu that can also be sampled without the dialogue. If we want to preserve the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we need all the help from Kinshasa that we can get.

In this connection, my delegation would like to suggest that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have a fresh look at the

nationality question. We understand that in 1981 the Zairean parliament repealed the 1972 nationality law, thus stripping the Banya Rwanda and the Banya Mulenge of their Zairean citizenship. To be sure, the Banya Mulenge were of Rwandan descent, but their forebears had migrated to South Kivu between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. This is, of course, a matter of domestic jurisdiction, and we are not suggesting that the Security Council should get involved in it. But we do want to point out that stripping ethnic groups of their nationality on account of their kinship with an ethnic group in a neighbouring country cannot be reconciled with the African doctrine of inviolate borders. Inviolate borders imply inviolate citizenship for all ethnic groups living within these borders.

This is just one instance of the many measures that can be taken to improve Lusaka's chances. The mission's report states that the Secretary-General's decision on deployment will be complex. We believe it can be made less complex by all of us.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The list of speakers is still very long. In order for the meeting to proceed smoothly, with the consent of Council members, I intend to suspend the meeting at 1.15 p.m. and resume it at 3.00 p.m.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of China.

At the outset, I would like to thank Ambassador Holbrooke for his briefing. My thanks also go to the Security Council's mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the comprehensive report it has submitted so promptly. My colleagues who spoke before me have all highly commended the work of the mission. I wholeheartedly endorse those comments.

I would like to emphasize the following. First, speeding up and completing the deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) should be the priority in the current efforts of the Security Council in dealing with the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The report reflects the strong desire of the people of that country for peace and their expectations of the United Nations. Despite the differences among the parties to the conflict on many issues, they all share the desire for the early deployment of the United Nations peacekeeping mission. The five heads of State of the region expressed the same desire when they met the mission. It is our hope that phase II of MONUC will be deployed smoothly and promptly, with a view to maintaining and consolidating the ceasefire and creating conditions for the implementation of other provisions of the Lusaka Agreement. In its peacekeeping operations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Nations should pay attention to the lessons of Sierra Leone and avoid the same mistake.

Secondly, during its visit the mission succeeded in bringing Uganda and Rwanda to an agreement on the withdrawal of their respective forces from Kisangani and the demilitarization of that city. We have noted the fact that the parties concerned are engaged in consultations on ways to implement the agreement. It is hoped that the agreement will be implemented effectively.

Thirdly, we have noted the fact that the Joint Military Commission (JMC) still faces enormous difficulties in the lack of financial resources and logistical support. The neutral facilitator for the national dialogue in the Democratic Republic of the Congo also faces a lack of financial resources. If this matter cannot be resolved in a timely manner, the smooth proceeding of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be affected. We hope that countries with the capacity to do so will continue to provide support to the JMC and the facilitator.

Fourthly, the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo still faces such enormous tasks as the complete withdrawal of forces, national dialogue and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of armed groups. In addition to the promotion and support provided by the international community, the political will of the parties concerned is imperative. Therefore, we favour the comments contained in paragraph 72 of the report to the effect that the ultimate responsibility for achieving peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo remains with the leaders of this region. The leaders of the parties concerned must honour their respective commitments to the Peace Agreement. Therefore, we welcome the proposal by Ambassador Levitte and expect the Security Council to invite the Political Committee of the parties to the conflict to meet in New York under his presidency and to discuss the difficult issues concerning the resolution of the conflict, so as to promote the peace process.

I now resume my capacity as the President.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Baali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this meeting to assess the developments in the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo following the recent visit by the Security Council delegation to Africa. It is true that today's meeting is being held within a particularly serious context, at a time when the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone is being severely tested and when armed confrontation between Ethiopia and Eritrea has resumed, ending the de facto ceasefire which held for more than a year. Despite the appeals for a ceasefire by the Security Council and the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), fighting that has caused considerable loss of life continues to rage, and we can only express our dismay and sadness at this tragedy, which the OAU, with the support of the United Nations, the United States and the European Union, had for months sought to prevent by patiently laying the groundwork for dialogue between the opposing parties.

Four months since the special meeting, organized by the Security Council on 26 January, major progress has been made in the implementation of the process to bring about a settlement of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by the parties and the international community alike. That special meeting, in which the American presidency of the Council invested so much, has actually started to have an impact and to be reflected in concrete actions on the ground. This progress should be preserved and strengthened so that the momentum of peace created in this matter can be maintained and preserved.

The recent useful and in many respects timely visit which members of the Council made to the region is precisely within this context. We would have wished that the ambassadors who visited Africa would be present today to hear our views on the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I realize that they must be occupied with other important tasks, but I would have hoped that they would have been here to hear the views of the OAU. The Council's visit, nevertheless, has enabled the representatives of the Council — and we welcome this — to transmit a message of the commitment of the international community to peace in the Congo and in the Great Lakes region in general, and also to take note once again of the formal commitment of the parties to the faithful and complete implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and to note firsthand the obstacles that emerge on the path to peace.

The report prepared following that visit clearly shows that the rapid and complete deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) remains more than ever the absolute priority. Its accomplishment as quickly as possible will actually make a decisive contribution to strengthening the current ceasefire, to developing confidence among parties and thus to the orderly implementation of all the other provisions of the Lusaka Agreement, which remains the only guarantee of a return to peace in the region.

In this connection, we welcome the entry into force of the ceasefire and disengagement agreement concluded at Kampala on 8 April 2000 by the Political Committee, and the signing of the status-of-forces agreement between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Nations. These two important achievements reflect the determination of the parties, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to move forward in the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and constitute fresh proof of their commitment to peace.

In its capacity as an African country and as Chairman-in-Office of the OUA, Algeria is following with special attention developments in the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to which, as members know, it actively contributes, whether through military observers or financing of the Joint Military Commission. It is in this context that the Chairman-in-Office of the OAU took the initiative of organizing a summit meeting on the Democratic Republic of the Congo in Algiers on 30 April, in which the Presidents of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria and South Africa, the representative of the President of Zambia, the Secretary-General of the OAU, the facilitator, Mr. Masire, and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations participated.

The Algiers summit made it possible to carry out an exhaustive evaluation of the progress achieved in the implementation of the peace process in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo, to reiterate the validity of the Lusaka Agreement and to call upon all the parties to the conflict to respect its provisions until peace is restored in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Great Lakes region. The Algiers summit also issued an appeal to States members of the OAU to contribute to the peace efforts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and announced the offers of troops made by South Africa and Nigeria to the United Nations.

While stressing the need to accelerate preparations for creating the conditions necessary to holding the inter-Congolese dialogue under the facilitation of Sir Ketumile Masire, the summit appealed to the Council to hasten the deployment of MONUC, a prerequisite for consolidating the ceasefire and strengthening the peace efforts.

The implementation of resolution 1291 (2000), in which the Security Council authorized the deployment of phase II of MONUC, should indeed be accelerated if we wish to avoid new disappointments in the Congo. In this connection, we are aware of the efforts being made by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to complete the preparations for this deployment. We also know that the preparation of the groundwork for sending troops and equipment for phase II has made major progress. We wish to encourage this while adding our voice to those who recommend that the lessons learned from other peace missions be taken fully into account in the context of the Congo. In stressing the need for speed in the deployment of the protection and logistic units of MONUC, we wish to emphasize the importance of the equipment and weapons that this force must have if it is to fulfil its mandate in the best possible conditions.

The precarious state of the infrastructures and means of communication in the Democratic Republic of the Congo requires movement and transport capacities to be strengthened and adapted. An additional effort is essential in this respect to make these means available on time in order to ensure the deployment of forces within the agreed time-frame.

We pay tribute here to all countries that have contributed troops to MONUC. Their commitment is what has allowed the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to prepare for phase II. We wish to stress in particular the contribution made by Italy of air and river transport units, which will be decisive to the success of the Mission. On this occasion, we invite other countries with the means and equipment sufficient and appropriate to MONUC's needs to follow Italy's example. Similarly, we hope that the appeals regularly issued by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations for specialized units and equipment for air traffic control, fuel storage, first aid and fire-fighting will soon be heeded, especially by the developed countries.

We are particularly encouraged by the progress achieved in recent weeks in the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In this regard, the conclusion of an agreement between Rwanda and Uganda on the practical modalities for their 100-kilometre withdrawal from the Congolese town of Kisangani, as well as the provisions made in the course of the Security Council mission to the region last week, reflect the will of the parties to move irreversibly forward to strengthen the ceasefire and to create conditions conducive to deploying MONUC.

The visit of Sir Ketumile Masire to rebel-held areas — his first since his designation as facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue — also represents a positive development following the commitment undertaken by Mr. Kabila, during both the Algiers summit and the Security Council mission, to extend his Government's support to the facilitator. This is an important development that should help launch dialogue among the Congolese, the success of which will surely ensure the success of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as a whole. We believe that the settlement of practical matters relating to this, such as the choice of venue, participants and timetable for the dialogue, should be made as soon as possible.

In this connection, the importance of this aspect of settling the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo requires the international community to give facilitator Masire its full political and financial support. The success of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo depends on it.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mwamba Kapanga (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): Allow me first of all to fulfil the pleasant duty of extending to you, Sir, on

behalf of my delegation and in my personal capacity, my warm and sincere congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council.

I also wish to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Canada, and to convey our gratitude and congratulations to him on his success as President of the Council last month.

My delegation also wishes sincerely to congratulate Ambassador Holbrooke and the members of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the report contained in document S/2000/416. We are convinced that the report will make a great contribution to charting the road to peace and sustainable development for millions of Congolese men and women, who, like all the inhabitants of the other continents, seek only to live decently in peace.

The members of the Council mission were able to witness firsthand the deep desire for peace of the Congolese people. The experience of Kananga speaks eloquently to this desire. Throughout the national territory of our country — from Mbandaka to Kisangani, from Goma to Bukavu, from Kindu to Mbuji-Mayi and from Lubumbashi to Bandundu, not to mention Kinshasa — children, fathers and mothers are calling for an end to the unspeakable suffering that has become their daily plight since the fateful day of 2 August 1998, when the horde of occupying forces from Burundi, Uganda and Rwanda swept unopposed through the Democratic Republic of the Congo like the angel of death, sowing misery and annihilation in their wake.

My country has spent two years in a pitiless war, the senseless nature of which has frequently been denounced by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and its Secretary-General, Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim. Through me, the Congolese people call on the international community to use all means available to put a final end to this war, of which it is ultimately the sole victim.

My Government hopes that the United Nations will absorb a full understanding of the resolve and of the great need for peace and domestic and external peace of the Congolese nation as a whole. My Government calls on the international community to become further involved in a sincere and positive effort to bring the aggressors to sincere negotiations for peace and regional stability, in respect for the relevant provisions of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement.

My delegation would like very sincerely to thank President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, for the organization of the Algiers summit of 30 April 2000 and for his continuing and tireless efforts to facilitate the rapid implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. The Algiers summit, in fact, made it possible to reaffirm the commitments undertaken during the meeting of the Political Committee held in Kampala, Uganda, from 6 to 8 April 2000, regarding a plan for disengagement and redeployment of forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in accordance with the Lusaka Agreement, as well as the decision to order a full cessation of hostilities to go into effect on 14 April.

We must indeed recognize that until now the ceasefire has been respected for the most part. It is certainly regrettable that the armies of Uganda and Rwanda have once again engaged in fierce fighting in the city of Kisangani. The civilian population of Kisangani, which, for an entire year has been the sacrificial victim of these acts of war, is the least of the concerns of these two countries for which Congolese lives are only a tool to achieve their mercantile goals. It is certainly equally deplorable that Uganda and the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo are stepping up their skirmishes in the Equateur Province. The most recent instance was the fighting that took place for control of the city of Bomongo on the border with the neighbouring Republic of the Congo.

But it is also certain that all of these activities are not of a scope that can endanger the peace process initiated in Lusaka. The war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a transnational war involving primarily States and Governments that are sensitive to friendly and other forms of pressure to restore peace in the region. This aspect distinguishes this situation from the situation in Sierra Leone.

My delegation thus shares the belief of the members of the Council's mission that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has its own special characteristics, that the peacekeeping operation must be judged on its own merits and that the situation in Sierra Leone should in no way obscure the responsibility of the leaders of the region and the international community in respect of the Democratic

Republic of the Congo, nor their capacity to make a real difference in my country.

The United Nations should therefore take advantage of this respite to proceed to the rapid deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). Mr. Laurent-Desiré Kabila, President of the Republic, assured the members of the Council's mission that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would not create any obstacle to such deployment. The head of State also reiterated the readiness of the Government to cooperate fully with MONUC.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its heartfelt thanks to all of those countries that have made a substantive contribution to MONUC and would like to say to them that their sons and daughters, who are committed to the cause of peace for my country, are welcome in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Congolese Government and people are ready to receive them in the best tradition of African hospitality.

Aside from stopping the fighting, the United Nations should also work at restoring the most fundamental rights of the Congolese population, as it is authorized to do by resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February of this year, primarily in paragraphs 12 through 15.

The non-governmental organization Human Rights Watch, based in New York, has just published a damning report on the brutal acts committed on occupied Congolese territory by the aggressors, in violation of the principles of human rights and of international humanitarian law. My Government urgently demands that the United Nations insist that the Governments of Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda, the Goma and Bunia factions of the Congolese Rally for Democracy and the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo immediately halt all attacks aimed at civilian populations. The United Nations must carry out investigations to establish the facts and begin legal proceedings against the perpetrators of these crimes.

As a result of armed aggression, my country has become the land of choice for illicit activities of all types. The United Nations has already shown itself to be seriously concerned by the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo by the forces of aggression. This practice fuels their war effort, thus perpetuating the destitution of the Congolese people. This is why my Government supports the proposal made to the Security Council by the Secretary-General to establish a group of experts, in accordance with paragraph 17 of resolution 1291 (2000), and asks that the Security Council follow up the Secretary-General's proposal.

My Government calls upon the Security Council to make this expert group effectively operational as quickly as possible in order to put an end to such activities, which are obviously accompanied by the destruction, the dismantling and the illegal transfer to the aggressor countries of economic, environmental and industrial infrastructure from the occupied provinces.

The inter-Congolese dialogue is one of the provisions of the Lusaka Agreement. The President of the Republic has rightly emphasized that the major objective of that dialogue continues to be the participation of the Congolese people at those meetings, thus allowing it to express itself freely on its future and also to choose or to determine the bodies that will govern the future of the Republic.

From their talks, both with the Government and with representatives of civil society, religious groups and political parties, the members of the Council's mission doubtless will have understood that an unequivocal consensus is emerging in favour of holding these meetings as soon as possible.

Since the outset of the aggression of which it has been a victim, my country has continued to reaffirm that the restoration of peace will allow for the establishment of a favourable climate for the implementation of the programme of national reconstruction and development that the people of the Congo so keenly desire. The aggression has put in jeopardy for a long time to come the development and well-being of the present and future generations of all countries of the Great Lakes region. All of our countries are now faced with the task of consolidating peace domestically and of economic reconstruction. Renewing good-neighbourly relations is a prerequisite of vital and primary importance. If all the countries of the region, assisted by the United Nations and the international community, grasp the complexities that have been at the foundation of the aggression and demonstrate their readiness to make sincere efforts, the

problems that we are facing should ultimately be settled.

We must have the courage to identify dispassionately the specific problems facing our countries and to take, within the framework of a global approach, reliable measures aimed at national reconciliation, power-sharing, the establishment of republican armies, the establishment or revitalization of the process of democratization, and development.

It is in this spirit that the Democratic Republic of the Congo supports the holding of an international conference on peace, stability, security and development in the Great Lakes region. Each country must bear full responsibility for its people, deal with its own contradictions and refrain from placing on others the burden of its own inability to manage its contradictions. The international community has a moral obligation to assist us in developing our capabilities to resolve our problems.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that from the United Nations and the Security Council, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is expecting, first, the deployment, as soon as possible, of phase II of MONUC, in order to establish conditions conducive to the withdrawal of the occupying forces; secondly, the establishment of an expert group to study the question of the illegal exploitation of the natural and other resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; thirdly, the early holding of the inter-Congolese dialogue; and fourthly, the effective implementation of the Lusaka Agreement.

My Government wishes to assure the Council of its full and total cooperation, so that the process begun in Lusaka can be successfully concluded.

The meeting was suspended at 1.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4143 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4143rd meeting

Wednesday, 17 May 2000, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cappagli
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Fowler
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Ag Oumar
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Yel'chenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Holbrooke

Agenda

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Security Council Mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 4-8 May 2000 (S/2000/416).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-43610 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 3.30 p.m.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kobayashi (Japan): I would like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for your leadership in convening this open meeting and thus providing an opportunity for us to present Japan's views on the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the Security Council mission that visited African countries to assess the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As is evident from the comprehensive report on their meetings with the Presidents of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as with several faction leaders, the members of the mission worked tirelessly to advance the peace process.

Our recent experiences in Sierra Leone may cast a negative shadow upon the future course of action that the Security Council may take in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, we must not allow the experiences in Sierra Leone to deter us from resolving the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The ceasefire agreement of 8 April provides an important basis for future peacemaking efforts, although as the subsequent incidents in Kisangani between the forces of Rwanda and Uganda have demonstrated, it is a fragile agreement. I wish to take this opportunity to call upon Rwanda and Uganda to withdraw from Kisangani, in accordance with their agreement. The recent hostilities between their forces are an infringement of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and cannot be tolerated.

Our experiences in past peacekeeping operations have taught us that the observance of a ceasefire must be confirmed before a peacekeeping force is deployed. In this connection, Japan fully supports the mission's recommendation that the Secretary-General obtain from the parties to the Lusaka Agreement their commitment, in writing, to maintain the ceasefire and support the deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). In our view, the special meeting of the Political Committee established by the Lusaka Agreement, to be convened in New York next month, would be a very appropriate occasion to obtain such commitment.

I sincerely hope that the international community will extend its strong support to the facilitator, Sir Ketumile Masire, in his efforts to engage the Congolese parties in a national dialogue. Most importantly, he needs solid financial backing. Only half the amount he requires to carry out his planned activities has been pledged so far, and we would like to call upon Member States to do their utmost to help meet the shortfall. For its part, the Government of Japan has contributed $300,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund to assist the facilitation activities of Sir Ketumile Masire. We have recently learned that he has had some difficulty drawing on those funds. We hope that he and the United Nations Secretariat will work together to resolve this issue in a mutually satisfactory manner.

Japan supports the proposition of holding the inter-Congolese dialogue in Kisangani and hopes that preparations for the dialogue will commence as planned by the facilitator. In this connection, I would like to suggest to the facilitator that he consider convening several dialogue meetings at the regional level with a view to consolidating the democratization process at the grass-roots level, for the success of the inter-Congolese dialogue in Kisangani.

Finally, I would like to stress that the international community should focus on the positive achievements made so far in the peace process for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and encourage the parties concerned to implement in an orderly manner the steps that have been agreed upon.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan): I would, first of all, like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's open meeting to review the report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo under the able leadership of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke.

The report submitted by the mission on completion of a whirlwind trip to the region highlights

the challenges that the United Nations faces and the measures that the parties to the conflict and the international community need to take to ensure success in our collective efforts to establish peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Pakistan believes that the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement is a comprehensive document, and its faithful implementation by all concerned could ensure a lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Pakistan also supports an active involvement of the Security Council in peacekeeping efforts, in accordance with the Ceasefire Agreement, so as to facilitate an early end to the protracted conflict.

One of the preconditions for phase II deployment of peacekeepers, outlined in Security Council resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February this year, is that "the parties respect and uphold the Ceasefire Agreement" and create a secure environment. We are reassured by the commitment given to the Security Council mission by President Kabila and others that they would facilitate an early deployment of peacekeepers.

While it is essential for all the parties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to move fast to engage in a sustained dialogue process to consolidate peace, we urge all concerned to ensure implementation of the Lusaka Agreement by facilitating an end to the arms flow from outside and the disarming of all members of the armed groups. All parties to the conflict must also protect human rights and respect international humanitarian law. Progress in these areas will be necessary to ensure the success of the peace process.

By resolution 1291 (2000), the Security Council has given a robust mandate to the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC). Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Mission has been given tasks as challenging as in the case of Sierra Leone. These tasks include protecting United Nations and co-located Joint Military Commission (JMC) facilities, installations and equipment; ensuring the security and freedom of movement of its personnel; and protecting civilians who are in imminent danger of physical violence. These are not easy tasks. The Mission should be adequately equipped to fulfil these tasks.

There is a need to focus our attention on effective planning and on deployment of peacekeepers. We would like to emphasize the requirement for a practical concept of operation and configuration of the force in such a manner that it is capable of supporting implementation of the Mission's mandate. The security component of the Mission should also be adequately equipped so that it proves to be an asset for the Mission. Particular note in this regard needs to be taken of the inadequacies of the planning for the deployment of peacekeepers in Sierra Leone, in order not to repeat these problems in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. While we agree that trust and confidence are essential for the success of a peacekeeping mission, there is no shortcut to effective preparation. As they say, prevention is better than cure.

As we indicated to the Council on an earlier occasion, Pakistan has committed one battalion group for deployment to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In keeping with our past traditions of extending unswerving support to United Nations peacekeeping efforts, we will do our utmost to contribute to the efforts of the international community to realize sustainable peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Our personnel in the field would like to see the Mission be successful so that they can take pride in their contribution to the cause of peace.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate our commitment to the progress and prosperity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as well as of the continent of Africa.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kumalo (South Africa): Over the past few weeks, the media worldwide was reporting negative stories about the United Nations having sent an inadequate peacekeeping mission to Sierra Leone. One positive story about the situation in Africa was on the fact-finding visit by the Security Council to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and neighbouring countries in search of a solution that may help bring peace to the Great Lakes region. My delegation would like to commend the Security Council for having made this important visit, and we hope that this visit will bring about an understanding in the Council that will eventually lead to an early deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) in the country.

Perhaps the most welcome news was the signing of the status-of-forces agreement between the United Nations and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We hope this agreement opens the way for the United Nations to deploy peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo without any hindrance.

South Africa remains committed to conflict resolution in our region. Together with partners in the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), our country was engaged in the behind-the-scenes negotiations to bring about peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which resulted in the Lusaka Peace Agreement. As the United Nations begins to prepare to send peacekeeping troops to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa has offered to join in supporting MONUC. We are pleased that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations is now engaged with our Government in finding ways in which my country can make a useful contribution to MONUC.

We must be realistic about what phase II of MONUC can accomplish. The primary tasks for MONUC will be to inject much-needed confidence into the peace process by monitoring the ceasefire and devising plans for a phase III deployment of United Nations peacekeepers. This planning must include a realistic framework and timetable for disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement. The search for long-term peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo cannot succeed as long as there are armed groups everywhere.

However, sending troops to the Democratic Republic of the Congo can only be the first step towards achieving peace in that troubled land. The bitter reality is that, in the end, the United Nations may not be able to mobilize the ideal size of peacekeeping force that a country as large as the Democratic Republic of the Congo may actually need. Therefore, my delegation believes that the contribution to peace coming out of the real political settlement to be reached through the inter-Congolese dialogue will be critical for creating stability in that country. South Africa has given assistance to Sir Ketumile Masire, the former President of Botswana, who is coordinating the inter-Congolese dialogue. We urge other countries to do the same, and we thank those that have already done so.

It is now left to our collective will to muster the political and material resources for a speedy deployment of MONUC phase II, as mandated by Security Council resolution 1291 (2000). The parties to the conflict themselves frequently expressed to the visiting Security Council mission that the deployment of MONUC phase II is crucial to sustaining the ceasefire. In our view, a speedy deployment will also give hope to the people of the Congo who have been left at the mercy of their tormentors.

South Africa agrees with the observation in the report that recent negative experiences encountered by the United Nations in Sierra Leone must not be allowed to derail our efforts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. While we cannot wish away the reality of the setbacks suffered in Sierra Leone, we can arm ourselves with valuable lessons learned. Sierra Leone has confirmed the lessons from Bosnia and elsewhere that it is important to send our troops with an appropriate mandate that takes account of the actual conditions in the area of deployment. It is equally critical to equip United Nations troops with the appropriate resources to carry out their mandate. If all of these things are put in place, we will have a realistic chance of ensuring the long-term success of MONUC.

The international community cannot afford to fail the Congolese people in their search for a lasting peace. Simultaneously, the international community cannot fail to recognize the responsibility of the Congolese people themselves to lay the foundations for their own much-needed peace.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Botswana. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mmualefe (Botswana): Let me thank you, Sir, for convening this important meeting. I wish also to convey our gratitude to the members of the Security Council mission that visited the Democratic Republic of the Congo recently for their comprehensive report. We are convinced that such visits by the Council members are vital to the work of this body and that they can contribute immensely to the enhancement of peace processes whenever undertaken in a timely fashion and with clear objectives, as was the case with the visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The report on the Security Council mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo acknowledges that the ceasefire voluntarily agreed to by the parties to the conflict in that country continues generally to hold. This is welcome news to us. We have also been informed that in addition to concluding a status-of-forces agreement, the head of State of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has personally undertaken to ensure full cooperation by his Government with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC).

Paragraph 70 of the report states in part that

> "The requirement for a professional ceasefire monitoring and verification force as mandated in resolution 1291 (2000) is self-evident. Each of the five Presidents consulted on this visit was unequivocal in his appeal for rapid deployment, and apprehensive about the sustainability of the ceasefire without it. The desperation of the Congolese people, whose suffering the mission could for the most part only imagine, clearly demands an international response". (*S/2000/416*)

The Republic of Botswana could not agree more with that precise analysis. We have urged the Council before to consider deploying speedily in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Even if conditions may not be 100 per cent conducive to a United Nations peacekeeping deployment, we believe that enough effort has been put in by the parties to the conflict to deserve the assistance of the international community. By continuously calling on the parties to abide by their obligations without an effective peacekeeping presence on the ground, we run the risk of allowing the precarious peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to unravel. We would therefore strongly urge the Council to heed the appeal of the regional leaders to deploy peacekeepers expeditiously.

We are aware that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a complex and difficult one. That gives us all the more reason to believe that the presence of peacekeepers will go a long way towards enhancing mutual confidence among the parties. In the same breath, we wish to urge our brethren in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to live by their promises to cooperate with MONUC and, most important, to ensure the safety and freedom of movement of United Nations personnel.

We wish to make a solemn appeal to the parties to the inter-Congolese dialogue to utilize the good offices of the facilitator, Sir Ketumile Masire, to chart a fruitful path for their future. The onus is on every one of them to ensure the productive outcome of their dialogue. We wish to repeat here once more that the facilitator can do only as much as the Congolese themselves are prepared to achieve. There is no doubt in our mind that Sir Ketumile is driven by no motivation other than to assist the Congolese in achieving an outcome they desire for their country.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Daka (Zambia): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting on the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In the same vein, I would like to commend the Security Council for undertaking a mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The meetings that members of the mission had with the leadership and other leading players in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and those held with the leaders of the neighbouring countries visited have, we hope, enhanced the Security Council's understanding and appreciation of the situation on the ground.

The report presented to the Council by Ambassador Richard Holbrooke of the United States, who headed the mission, gives us hope and encouragement. It is clear from the report that all the signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement are prepared to honour their commitments towards the full implementation of the peace process. We note in this regard the eagerness of the signatories to implement the Lusaka process.

The recent signing of the status-of-forces agreement and the progress made so far in the implementation of the plan for the disengagement of forces presents the Security Council with the opportunity to fully and immediately deploy phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). It is important that this be done without further delay in order to avoid creating a vacuum.

With regard to the inter-Congolese dialogue, my delegation would like to stress the need to urgently provide the necessary financial and logistical support to Sir Ketumile Masire, the neutral facilitator, to enable him to undertake his important task in the peace process. The holding of the inter-Congolese dialogue is indispensable to the successful implementation of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have endured a great deal of suffering. The international community needs to respond urgently to the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in order to enable the people in that country to lead a normal life. We strongly believe that the deployment of phase II of MONUC could be a start in achieving that objective. The time to act is now.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Swaziland. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mamba (Swaziland): Allow me, Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of the Kingdom of Swaziland, to extend my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of this important organ for the month of May and to thank you for convening this meeting of the Council to consider the report on the Security Council mission visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I also extend our thanks to Ambassador Holbrooke for his introduction of the report on the mission this morning and for his able leadership of the mission during its visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

A little over four months ago, under the presidency of the United States, the Security Council convened to consider the question relating to the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That meeting was graced by the presence and participation of heads of State from the region. During that meeting, the heads of State made it clear that the Lusaka peace process had reached a stalemate and that there was an urgent need for it to be supported in order for its ultimate goal to be realized. The recent fact-finding visit to the region by the Security Council mission is but a fulfilment of the desire expressed by the leaders of the region in January that urgent action be taken by the international community to bring durable peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and bears testimony to the fact that the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have suffered long enough and that the international community must act now. Further inaction will only serve to worsen the situation. It is with this concern in mind that my delegation welcomes and considers the visit of the Security Council's mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo as a clear expression of the Security Council's commitment to the strengthening of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

We welcome the mission's efforts to harmonize relations between the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) and the Government in Kinshasa, as demonstrated by the signing of the status-of-forces agreement on 4 May. We are convinced that this agreement will be crucial in ensuring the effectiveness of MONUC and that eventually it will be pivotal to the deployment of phase II of MONUC, the success of which will be a major milestone in the peace process.

My delegation is disturbed to learn that the inter-Congolese dialogue, a vital and critical component of the peace process, is beset with difficulties, including lack of funds and logistical support. We join those who have spoken before us in encouraging those that have pledged funds in support of the efforts of the facilitator, Sir Ketumile Masire, to make them available without further delay. We cannot agree more with the mission's observation that protracted discussions over the venue of the dialogue should not be allowed to delay the talks' being launched as expeditiously as possible.

The report further addresses the current circumstances of peacekeeping in Africa and elsewhere, with particular emphasis on the Sierra Leone tragedy, about the deployment of peacekeepers before a conflict has run its course. My delegation fully supports the recommendations of the mission that the developments in Sierra Leone should not be used as a yardstick for future deployments of this nature in the continent and that the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be viewed on its own merits. We are therefore in favour of the view that the Secretary-General, acting within the confines of resolution 1291 (2000), should solicit credible assurances from the parties to the conflict for the security and freedom of movement of United Nations and other related personnel.

The President *(spoke in Chinese)*: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Portugal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Brito (Portugal): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey align themselves with this statement.

The European Union is pleased to again have the opportunity to express its views on the evolving situation in the Great Lakes region, and in particular on the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We commend the efforts of the Security Council, notably through its valuable recent mission to Kinshasa and Lusaka, and we welcome and endorse the recommendations contained in its report. The European Union hopes that its recommendations will lead to effective progress being achieved on the ground. However, we remain concerned that the parties have not yet shown the necessary commitment to implement fully their obligations, and we cannot avoid having the impression that some of the issues we need to address here today have been addressed before, without significant progress being achieved on the ground.

The European Union is strongly committed to the implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and welcomes recent developments, notably the Kampala disengagement plan and the last summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), in Algiers. However, strong political will and unequivocal commitment from the parties is necessary to guarantee peaceful implementation. Recent events in Kisangani demonstrate the fragility of the present ceasefire. It is therefore incumbent upon this Council to maintain diplomatic and political pressure on the belligerent parties to comply with their agreed commitments, building on the success of the statement agreed by the Security Council mission with the parties on the ground.

The European Union reaffirms its willingness to continue to support the Joint Military Commission (JMC), the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) and the rapid deployment of its phase II, provided that the parties give the necessary guarantees for it to carry out its mandate effectively. I recall in this regard that the European Union has already provided the amount of 1.2 million euros in support of the JMC.

The European Union reiterates its deep concern at the ongoing illegal exploitation of natural resources, in particular minerals, in violation of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We welcome the Secretary-General's proposal for the creation of an expert panel, as mentioned in Security Council resolution 1291 (2000).

The European Union reaffirms its strong support for the inter-Congolese dialogue, a key element of the restoration of the rule of law, democracy and the national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We hope that the inter-Congolese dialogue will be fully transparent, representative and free of all external interference. We fully support the work being carried out by former President Sir Ketumile Masire and are considering further ways of assisting him in discharging his difficult task.

We are all well aware of the number and complexity of the political, economic and social factors at the root of the conflict in the Great Lakes region of Africa. For progress to be achieved, a continued realistic, integrated and coherent approach by the international community, using different types of instruments appropriate to the prevailing circumstances, needs to be maintained. To this end, the European Union's envoy to the Great Lakes region has continued to work with the parties, other mediators and the United Nations to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the international community's efforts. In this light, the European Union believes that it is appropriate to continue to consider the idea of a conference on peace, security, democracy and development in the Great Lakes region, to be organized by the OAU and the United Nations, whose preparatory work should start as soon as the main elements of the Lusaka agreement have been implemented.

The European Union will work with MONUC and the JMC, together with the parties to the Lusaka Agreement, other donors, the United Nations, the World Bank and interested African countries on options and possible solutions for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of forces involved in the armed conflict, including non-statutory forces. The

European Union also remains committed to continuing to work within the European Union/Southern African Development Community working group on illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons to prevent arms from flowing into conflict zones in the Great Lakes region.

The European Union is also committed to providing humanitarian assistance and assistance for the return and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons and to adopting specific measures for the regions most affected by the conflict.

The President *(spoke in Chinese)*: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mwakawago (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania joins others in welcoming the report presented by Ambassador Holbrooke on the visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo by the Security Council mission. The visit itself was, for us, a clear determination by the Council to make a real difference in the aspirations and hopes of the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for peace and stability for development.

The report demonstrates that the mission has succeeded in three ways. First, it has vindicated the continued significance of the Lusaka Peace Agreement as the only viable framework for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Secondly, it has underscored the urgency on the part of the United Nations of the deployment of military observers, as provided under the terms of Security Council resolution 1291 (2000). Lastly, in spite of some setbacks, the commitment of all the parties to the Lusaka Agreement and resolution 1291 (2000) was, without exception, reaffirmed.

These were no small achievements in the span of one week. Those who had questions on whether such a visit was really needed would undoubtedly find comfort in the mission briefing. It all comes down to one critical undertaking: deployment of phase II of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) should not be delayed any longer.

Quite rightly the mission report notes that the events in Sierra Leone have cast a shadow over the mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, it also makes a valid observation which we cannot lose sight of: the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has its own unique characteristics, and the peacekeeping operation there must be judged on its own merits. Unlike Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo does not have a Foday Sankoh. All warring parties have supported, indeed urged, the presence of the United Nations. In this regard even in Sierra Leone we should act firmly to suppress the likes of Mr. Sankoh and his wayward rebels who have violated the will of the people of Sierra Leone, of Africa and of the international community.

Consequently, what underlines the broad support for the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region is the need for swift and determined action to ensure implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. Without a doubt, the mission has noted some fragile aspects. But we do not, and we must not, see these aspects as undermining the relevance of the Agreement. Setbacks ought to have been expected from the outset. Our challenge is to continue urging the parties to walk down the road to peace and security for the people and countries of the region to which they are all committed.

In that context we note, and welcome, the parties' reaffirmation of their support to MONUC. The United Nations needs, therefore, to speed up its contribution in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The meeting of the visiting mission with Congolese civil society, religious groups and political parties vindicated the support of the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for rapid deployment of phase II of MONUC. That the mission to Kananga, comprised of Ambassador Andjaba of Namibia, Ambassador van Walsum of the Netherlands and Ambassador Greenstock of the United Kingdom, was "struck by the great warmth of their reception by the citizens and their clear desire for peace" is foretelling of the expectations of the United Nations on the part of the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The mission was rightly concerned about the recent fighting in Kisangani. We welcome the fact that the mission had the opportunity to raise their concerns with Presidents Kagame of Rwanda and Museveni of Uganda and managed to broker an agreement between them to stop the fighting. We also welcome that the two Presidents agreed to institute measures designed to begin a phased withdrawal in accordance with the

disengagement plan of 8 April. As a result of a follow-up summit meeting by Presidents Kagame and Museveni, hosted by my President, His Excellency Mr. Benjamin Mkapa, in Mwanza, northern Tanzania, on 14 May, we are now even more optimistic about the commitment of the two Presidents to the disengagement plan. Needless to say, the urgent deployment of MONUC in the area is of critical importance.

We will not tire in our calls for continued and sustained support of the office of the facilitator. President Sir Ketumile Masire's noble effort should not fail for want of support or assistance. In a similar vein, we urge the Congolese people to embrace his efforts in the interests of comity and peace for their people and country.

Our delegation cannot hide its deep concern about allegations of serious human rights violations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, particularly in eastern Congo. The apparent acknowledgement of an instance in which a number of persons — indeed, women — were buried alive is in itself shocking, to say the least. That what was at dispute was not the factual incident but the number is horrifying. That "it only concerned three women" and that "the other side did it too" is an admission that this body cannot condone. We must condemn it as we continue to demand a thorough investigation and ultimate culpability. We have often enough demanded that impunity should not go unpunished. Our reported outrage at the victimization of innocent and unarmed civilians, especially women and children, must be matched with firm action.

The Lusaka Peace Agreement and the United Nations process set in motion by Council resolution 1291 (2000) can interact effectively. It would be a tragedy if the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo were led to believe that a weary international community on peacekeeping cannot be counted upon in their hour of need. A legitimate peace process is in motion. If this Council and the United Nations are to continue to be relevant to Africa, then it is imperative that the needs of people of Sierra Leone, Angola and, in this particular case, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to mention but a few, must be taken on board.

A ray of hope is on the horizon. We urge the Security Council to translate hopes into concrete action.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Jokonya (Zimbabwe): Like all my colleagues who spoke before me, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The timing of today's meeting, coming as it does immediately after the release of the report of the Security Council mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo from 4 to 8 May 2000, could not be more than perfect, and Zimbabwe regards it a privilege to pronounce itself over an issue of such import before the Council.

My delegation takes this opportunity to reiterate the sentiments expressed by President Robert Mugabe during his meeting with the Security Council team in Harare on 6 May. President Mugabe informed the Council team that now was the opportune moment for the United Nations to deploy peacekeepers in order to prevent any further unravelling of the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. According to President Mugabe, the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) should not be contingent upon progress or the lack of it in the inter-Congolese dialogue, since the conflict remained uppermost in people's minds.

Besides associating himself with the United Nations position on the issue of the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, President Mugabe also submitted that Zimbabwe would extend its full cooperation to any expert panel created by the Security Council, including in the areas of the Democratic Republic of the Congo under its control.

On a sad note, while the Security Council mission was visiting the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Corporal Foday Sankoh's Revolutionary United Front rebels flagrantly violated the ceasefire in Sierra Leone and in the process rekindled assertions by afro-pessimists that Africa was a lost cause and that the continent could not be saved. Some so-called experts on Africa have feverishly taken to the media to remind the West of Somalia and the "Mogadishu syndrome" — a perception that Africa's civil wars are somewhat different and more intractable than those in other

regions. I do not need to remind the Council that this perception is not borne out by experience. The impression I got from reading the New York tabloids was: "Let Africa drift in her own sea of misery and hopelessness. It is of no concern to us."

Sadly, the media, which should be playing a very important role in awakening the conscience of the international community in order to draw its attention to needy peoples, last week wittingly helped foster a misperception that Africa is a continent caught in an unbreakable downward spiral. In spite of this negative publicity by the media about events in Africa, my delegation is glad that Article 24 of the United Nations Charter clearly states that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the Security Council, and not with the media. This Article arose from the fact that the international community, having seen two world wars, is not prepared to descend again to that depth of human loss, genocide and holocaust. It is in conformity with this role that the United Nations has tried over the years of its existence to intervene in all areas of conflict that clearly go beyond the ability of the parties involved to solve. The aim is to save lives.

Let me observe that some regions are more fortunate than others in their history and geography. My own continent of Africa has witnessed more United Nations peacekeeping failures than any other. Some of us are still haunted by vivid memories of occasions when the United Nations found it easier to walk away from Africa in its hour of need than to mandate and equip a mission that could have saved the day for us all. On more numerous occasions, the United Nations has found excuses to drag its feet while African situations have flared up. Even in the cases where African subregional arrangements have stepped in to contain situations in anticipation of Security Council assistance, the United Nations has stood aloof. The peace opportunities in Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, created by regional initiatives through the Lomé Agreement and the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, respectively, should not be allowed to unravel.

Last year, repeated pleas by African leaders for a robust Chapter VII peacekeeping mandate in Sierra Leone were spurned and, in hindsight, it has become clear that half-hearted efforts seriously undermine the credibility of the United Nations and call into question its commitment to peacekeeping, particularly in Africa. The Sierra Leone case has demonstrated that all successful United Nations operations depend on clear and unambiguous mandates that equally provide the resources to support the missions.

The heads of State of the States parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement addressed the Security Council, under the presidency of Richard Holbrooke of the United States during the "month of Africa" in January 2000, and affirmed their unwavering commitment to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. It is now almost half a year since the heads of State convened in New York and yet the deployment of MONUC has not yet been effected. This is a cause of concern to those suffering civilians in the areas of conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The report before us is a reiteration of the belligerents' commitment to the peace process. We therefore urge the Security Council immediately to deploy MONUC observers, who will be able to identify and verify parties that break the ceasefire, thereby enabling the Security Council to impose costs on those bent on pursuing the military option.

Unlike Somalia, where the United Nations encountered a collapsed State with no Government to account for its morally reprehensible behaviour, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo we have six States that are Members of the United Nations. Surely the United Nations has means and ways to discourage wayward behaviour by its Member States. The allied forces of the Southern African Development Community are ready to withdraw from the Democratic Republic of the Congo in fulfilment of their Lusaka ceasefire obligations and we hope that other signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement will oblige in like manner. My delegation further implores the Security Council to deploy a peacekeeping mission with a robust Chapter VII mandate that will complete the work of phase II of MONUC.

History has taught us that any enforcement action requires the deployment of a force that is overwhelming enough, both in numbers and in capability, to force warring parties to accept terms laid down in a peace agreement.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Rwanda. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mutaboba (Rwanda): As this is the first time I have taken the floor since the most recent open meeting of the Security Council, I wish to express my delegation's delight at seeing you, Sir, in the presidency. We also wish to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Fowler, for a job well done, and the same appreciation goes to the whole membership around this table for a sustained effort in the search for peace and security in the world. We can only express a strong wish to see you, Mr. President, redoubling your efforts and vigilance to avoid such surprises as we have encountered before.

The Government of Rwanda is very grateful to the Security Council for the mission led by the very able Ambassador Holbrooke. It was my pleasure to welcome the delegation to Kigali, and its members are right to say that we had frank discussions. What they forgot to say is that we were sometimes brutally frank in order to make sure that telling the truth should supersede the speeches we often hear from those trying to conceal it in order to feel good.

President Kagame asked me to thank all members of the mission, bearing in mind that he was able to share and to make concrete proposals that led to solving the tragic and regrettable incidents we did not start in Kisangani. None of us had the deliberate intention of getting local civilians hurt in the first place, nor has that ever been our Government's intention at all.

Rwanda is still committed to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. We believe it is the sole viable framework for achieving peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region. Reference to the incident in Kisangani as a deliberate violation by some of the Lusaka Agreement is totally wrong and should not be used as yet another delaying tactic from some parties to slow momentum. We need ever more pragmatic progressive approaches, such as those proposed by President Kagame and agreed to by President Museveni and the Security Council mission. I am happy to provide the members of the Council with a copy of the latest joint statement on the demilitarization of Kisangani and, on the instructions of my Government, it may be circulated as a document of the Security Council at members' earliest convenience.

Peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region cannot come our way as long as we fix our eyes on the Democratic Republic of the Congo alone. We need to see the Democratic Republic of the Congo as part of a region in crisis, address the root causes and do this individually and collectively. That is why we still believe that there can be no peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region until evil armed forces are disarmed, demobilized, demilitarized, rehabilitated and reintegrated into their respective societies. We have been hearing some rumours leading us to believe that some countries may be planning to take our citizens to their respective countries. We appreciate their hospitality, but none of them likes our people better than we do. Experience shows that those already repatriated, rehabilitated and reintegrated are happy to be home, sweet home. They themselves have had a chance to say that killing is wrong and should be punished. If you take them to your countries, they will miss this opportunity forever to repent and to reconcile themselves with their society. Those trying to take them should think about that. It is imperative that we find a durable solution to the problem of these armed groups.

Demilitarization and demobilization can be done peacefully and voluntarily, we agree. However, there is a blatant need for those forces and their supporters to cooperate for it to be done peacefully and voluntarily. Otherwise it will be a mere contradiction. The experience of refugee camps in the then eastern Zaire is still vivid in our memories: the international community had failed in the name of an idealistic, peaceful and voluntary process. We should learn from that, and from the success of the repatriation of over 2 million refugees who were then costing the international community over $1 million a day.

The demobilization and repatriation of members of the Interahamwe, the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces and other similar forces is a prerequisite to a successful return of peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region. Once this is seriously considered, and in the spirit of Lusaka, then the inter-Congolese dialogue may be a factor for overall lasting peace and security within and across the Democratic Republic of the Congo's borders. Law and order are necessary for political dialogue. The political dialogue itself brings respect for human and citizen's rights. That is why MONUC needs to be deployed without further ado. That is why we strongly believe

that President Sir Ketumile Masire needs to be supported both politically and financially.

Peace is not a one-way business. You have peace and you give it to your family, your neighbours, your nation and the whole world. It is returned to you, and the cycle continues. Sovereignty is a two-way business, too. You cannot scream for your national sovereignty while blasting your neighbours. You do not solve matters by singing the same old tune all the time: you use your imagination and become .creative; you compose songs expressing the mood of the time and you keep the momentum going all the way through. This is what is needed today in search for peace and security in the world. It is the United Nations duty as the world body, and it is ours as Members who support our Organization.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to take this opportunity to thank in one statement all speakers who have addressed kind words for me.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4144

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4144th meeting

Wednesday, 17 May 2000, 11.45 p.m.

New York

Chairman:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Listre
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Duval
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Keita
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. Hamer
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Jerandi
	Ukraine	Mr. Yel'chenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Eldon
	United States of America	Ms. Soderberg

Agenda

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-43687 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

The President *(spoke in Chinese)*: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2000/440, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/2000/430, letter dated 15 May 2000 from Ethiopia, transmitting a letter of the same date from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia; S/2000/435, letter dated 15 May 2000 from Ethiopia, transmitting a communiqué of the sixty-fourth session of the Central Organ of the Organization of African Unity; and S/2000/437, letter dated 12 May 2000 from Portugal, transmitting the declaration by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/2000/440) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President *(spoke in Chinese)*: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1298 (2000).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 11.50 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4145

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4145th meeting

Friday, 19 May 2000, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mársico
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Fowler
	France	Mr. Teixeira da Silva
	Jamaica	Mr. Ward
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Kasse
	Namibia	Mrs. Ashipala-Musavyi
	Netherlands	Mr. Hamer
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Jerandi
	Ukraine	Mr. Yel'chenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Minton

Agenda

The situation in Sierra Leone

Letter dated 17 May 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/446).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-43902 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Sierra Leone

Letter dated 17 May 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/446)

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Sierra Leone, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamara (Sierra Leone), took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the letter dated 17 May 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/2000/446.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/2000/449, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/2000/433, letter dated 15 May 2000 from Sierra Leone, transmitting the text of a government statement on the third meeting of the Joint Implementation Committee on the Lomé Peace Agreement; S/2000/434, letter dated 15 May 2000 from Sierra Leone, transmitting the text of a broadcast message to the nation by the President of Sierra Leone; and S/2000/441, letter dated 9 May 2000 from Mali addressed to the Secretary-General.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/2000/449) before it. If I hear no objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President *(spoke in Chinese):* There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1299 (2000).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.4146

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4146th meeting

Tuesday, 23 May 2000, 12 noon

New York

President:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Listre
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Fowler
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Keita
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Victorov
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Yel'chenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Ms. Soderberg

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) (S/2000/460)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-44378 (E)

The meeting was called to order at noon.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) (S/2000/460)

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tadmoury (Lebanon) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), document S/2000/460.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/2000/443 and S/2000/465, letters dated 15 and 22 May 2000 respectively, from Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council welcomes and strongly endorses the report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 2000 (S/2000/460). The Council stresses again the importance of, and the need to achieve, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, based on all its relevant resolutions, including its resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973.

"The Security Council welcomes the intention of the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to enable the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to confirm that a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon has taken place in compliance with its resolution 425 (1978), and to take all necessary steps in order to deal with possible eventualities, bearing in mind that the cooperation of all parties will be essential. The Council welcomes the intention of the Secretary-General to report on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon in accordance with its resolution 425 (1978).

"The Security Council fully endorses the requirements put forward by the Secretary-General for confirming the compliance of all parties concerned with its resolution 425 (1978), calls on all parties concerned to cooperate fully in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary-General, and requests the Secretary-General to report on their fulfilment of the requirements when he reports on the withdrawal.

"The Security Council calls upon the States and other parties concerned to exercise utmost restraint and to cooperate with UNIFIL and the United Nations to ensure the full implementation of its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). The Council shares the view of the Secretary-General that it is crucial that the States and other parties concerned do their part to calm the situation, ensure the safety of the civilian population, and cooperate fully with the United Nations in its efforts to stabilize the situation, to restore international peace and security and to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area following confirmation of withdrawal.

"The Security Council welcomes the decision of the Secretary-General to send his Special Envoy back to the region immediately to ensure that the requirements put forward by the Secretary-General are met and to ensure the commitment of all the parties concerned to cooperate fully with the United Nations in the complete implementation of its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

"The Security Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation and its full support for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Envoy to the region and his staff. It commends UNIFIL's troops and troop-contributing countries for their commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances. The Council stresses its concern that all the parties concerned cooperate with the United Nations, and recalls the relevant principles contained in the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel of 1994."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2000/18.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4147

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4147th meeting

Thursday, 25 May 2000, 3.30 p.m.
New York

Chairman	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members	Argentina	Mr. Mársico
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Vámos-Goldman
	France	Mr. Teixeira da Silva
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Keita
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Krokhmal
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Eldon
	United States of America	Ms. Soderberg

Agenda

The situation in East Timor

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-44996 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in East Timor

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Hédi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite Mr. Annabi to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Hédi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. I call on Mr. Annabi.

Mr. Annabi: This briefing will cover, as the Council requested, the developments in East Timor since this item was last discussed in the same format on 27 April. I will mention briefly the main political developments, the security situation, economic matters, governance and public administration and the situation of the refugees.

As regards the main political developments, the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) has continued its efforts to normalize relations between Indonesia and East Timor. A new round of talks in Jogjakarta, Indonesia, began last Monday and was completed today. The agenda of those discussions included mechanisms to resolve claims regarding assets and liabilities, the transfer of civil and administrative archives back to East Timor, the settlement of pension obligations to former East Timorese civil servants, the establishment of a joint border commission and, of particular importance, the implementation of the commitment to allow unimpeded access between the Oecussi enclave and the rest of East Timor. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello, is scheduled to visit Jakarta on 29 May for further high-level discussions with the Government of Indonesia. I should also mention that Mr. Xanana Gusmao paid a very successful visit to Jakarta on 28 April.

In East Timor itself, there has been an increase in political activity. Political parties have opened offices and held meetings in the districts. Freitlin, the longstanding pro-independence party, has held a series of regional conferences culminating in a national party conference held from 15-20 May, attended by some 1,250 delegates. The main theme of the congress was the need to replace the political in-fighting of the past with democratic practices and pluralism.

UNTAET has intensified its consultations with the East Timorese on all important policy issues affecting the conduct of the interim administration. The National Consultative Council has met five times. In addition to approving a regulation banning illegal logging and an amendment of the existing regulation on the judiciary, the National Consultative Council has collaborated closely with UNTAET in preparing for the Lisbon donor conference, both in its formal sessions and during three joint UNTAET/World Bank workshops. At the heart of this effort is, of course, the preparation of East Timor's budget for the period July 2000 to June 2001. As members of the Council are aware, the Lisbon conference is scheduled to be held from 21 to 23 June.

In order to promote public debate on key policy questions, public hearings have also been instituted under the aegis of the National Consultative Council. The first hearing, which was devoted to taxation issues, was held on 17 May and included members of the business community, non-governmental organizations and UNTAET officials.

The overall security situation has remained stable over the past month. Militia activity on the border with West Timor has declined. The deployment of an additional Indonesian battalion to the border, and the implementation of the 11 April Memorandum of Understanding for Tactical Coordination between the Indonesian armed forces (TNI) and UNTAET has had a beneficial and positive impact.

I mentioned last month that UNTAET was reviewing the strength of its military component. It has now initiated a reduction by some 500 troops, which

will be pulled out of the eastern sector. The situation in that sector has been calm and stable from the outset. This will be achieved by October through scheduled troop rotations as well as through the reduction of the Force Logistic Group, which will be reduced to a squadron. Some of its tasks will be performed by contractors. The current level of UNTAET troops deployed in East Timor stands at 8,396; it will as a result of these reductions come down to 7,896 by October.

The Armed Forces for the National Liberation of East Timor (FALINTIL) has remained cantoned at Aileu. A number of FALINTIL personnel were attached to UNTAET's military sector headquarters, where they are assisting in liaison with the East Timorese population. Others have begun to leave cantonment at Aileu to find employment. In order to improve the living conditions in Aileu, relief assistance has been provided to vulnerable groups there.

The law and order situation in East Timor has remained a concern. Crime is still high, and considerable effort is required to contain the readiness of some East Timorese to resort to violence. During the past month there was, fortunately, only one significant incident. On 30 April, a fight between youth groups at a Dili sports demonstration spilled over to the nearby central market and continued sporadically for several hours, resulting in four injuries and 18 arrests. Following that incident, UNTAET's police were authorized to carry side arms.

Two prisons were opened, in Becora and in Gleno. This has greatly facilitated the work of the police and the judiciary. Plans are under way to rehabilitate two more prisons, in Baucau and in Manatuto. The judicial system has begun to function, and the first pre-trial public hearing was held from 11 to 15 May.

Pursuant to the 7 April Memorandum of Understanding on judicial and legal and human rights cooperation, the Attorney-General of Indonesia requested documentation compiled by UNTAET on five criminal cases associated with last year's violence. UNTAET is in contact with Indonesian officials to work out the necessary arrangements for making the requested information available.

UNTAET's investigation into the 1999 violence has continued. In Oecussi, 20 bodies were exhumed of persons killed in a massacre on 8 September 1999 in a location known as Passabe. UNTAET has also continued to monitor the current human rights situation in East Timor with particular emphasis on episodes of intimidation and harassment against ethnic and religious minorities.

Turning to economic matters, the number of private businesses registered in East Timor, both foreign and Timorese, has risen from 1,200 last month to over 2,000 today, creating new employment opportunities in the private sector. Private sector loans are also being made to prospective small businesses through a project funded by the World Bank.

The implementation of UNTAET's Quick Impact Projects has continued. A total of 4,473 persons have been employed as a result of those projects, which are being conducted in various parts of East Timor. An additional 14,606 persons have been employed under the Temporary Employment Project of the United States Agency for International Development, which has injected some $3.3 million into the local economy. The Japanese Agency for International Cooperation has also employed more than 11,000 persons on a temporary basis through several reconstruction projects, mainly road rehabilitation, for an estimated cost of $9.8 million.

East Timor's road network, which was already impaired by years of neglect and heavy use, has deteriorated dangerously as a result of an unusually long wet season. Recent flooding has resulted in a number of major roads being cut, temporarily isolating some district centres and impeding UNTAET's work in all sectors. Los Palos, Viqueque and Suai were hardest hit. Considerable resources will be required to rehabilitate the road system once the dry season sets in.

As regards governance and public administration, the central fiscal authority has became fully operational with the appointment of the head and deputy head of the authority on 17 May. Customs and immigrations operations have begun on the western border with the opening of a border post at Batugade. To date, $1,059,000 has been collected in customs and sales tax. This is a modest beginning, but it is a beginning nonetheless.

The civil service campus was inaugurated on 8 May, and will serve as the headquarters of the civil service academy in East Timor. The academy will be the umbrella organization for all efforts to provide public service training, including courses for the

unemployed. The number of civil servants has continued to rise, and now stands at more than 4,500, including some 2,050 teachers.

The number of students enrolled in schools has also risen, by more than 23,000, to a total of over 163,000.

An Interim Health Authority has been fully established and is presently staffed with 29 East Timorese health professionals, 13 district health officers and 7 international staff. The first office of the East Timor Postal Service was opened in Dili on 29 April, followed by a Baucau branch on the next day.

Regarding the East Timorese refugees, only some 1,000 additional refugees have returned to East Timor over the past month. This brings the total number of returnees to a little more than 161,000.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that some 90,000 remain, principally in West Timor. It should be noted in this context that the Indonesian authorities estimate that there around 125,000 refugees remaining in West Timor. The census, which I mentioned last month and which was to be conducted by UNHCR was somewhat delayed, but it has now begun. We will bring the results to the attention of the Council in due course.

The militias active in the camps have continued their campaign of disinformation about the conditions in East Timor.

As mentioned earlier, East Timor suffered severe flooding, particularly in Suai, Viqueque and Los Palos. However, as members of the Council are aware, the situation in West Timor, as a result of the floods there, is much worse. Tens of thousands of people have been displaced, 126 persons are confirmed dead, most of them women and children. About half of the casualties of these floods in West Timor were East Timorese who were living in low-lying refugee camps.

In conclusion, as I have tried to show in the course of this briefing, UNTAET has continued during the past month to make progress in the implementation of its mandate, in particular in the areas of institution- and capacity-building and in the delivery of government services. This progress may not be as quick as we or the Timorese would like it to be, but it is steady progress, and we believe that its pace will increase in the weeks and months to come.

UNTAET has also continued to expand its consultative mechanisms with the East Timorese in order to enable them to gain a better understanding of the challenges at hand and to involve them as much as possible in the decision-making process so that they can prepare for independence, which is, of course, the ultimate goal of UNTAET.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Mr. Annabi for his comprehensive briefing. I now give the floor to the members of the Council.

Mr. Eldon (United Kingdom): Your stewardship of the Council, Mr. President, has proved eminently wise this month, and I can do no better than to echo your wise words of thanks to Assistant Secretary-General Annabi. Again, his briefing has been extremely useful and extremely comprehensive. It demonstrates the scale of the difficulties that the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) has to face. It really is quite a remarkable mission, in the sense of having to build an infrastructure from the bottom up and prepare a territory for independence with very little to start from. It also demonstrates the ingenuity with which those challenges are being tackled and the progress that is being made.

I would like to start almost in reverse order compared to Mr. Annabi, by considering refugees. I find it interesting to note that the rate of return over the last month, and since the Council was last briefed, is down to only about 1,000 persons. We think that it is now time to clarify how many people remain in the refugee camps in West Timor, and we are pleased that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) census is going ahead. It is clearly very important that the remaining refugees should be registered expeditiously — not least because of the activities of the militia and not least because it will be very important to know and to get a good feel for the reasons why they have not returned. The register will be a useful tool in helping to create the conditions for those still in the camps to return home. We hope that UNHCR and the Indonesian Government will quickly be able to resolve issues such as pension payments, which are currently restraining many of the refugees from making that leap. Those who wish to return should be allowed to do so swiftly and safely.

In this connection, we are particularly concerned about the effects of the recent floods in West Timor.

We were very pleased that UNTAET was able to provide assistance to the Indonesian authorities in some areas, in coping with the floods, but it is particularly troubling that so many of those who have been killed or displaced are refugees from East Timor. We fully support anything that UNTAET can do to provide further assistance in the relief efforts. I think we should all think very carefully about what we can do in relation to those poor people who have effectively had to suffer a double whammy, both of displacement from East Timor and now of natural disaster. What I had to say earlier about the need for refugee returns applies doubly to those people who find themselves flooded out in West Timor.

I would like to turn now to the question of resources. It is almost a truism that UNTAET can be fully effective only if it is properly resourced. We continue to have some concern that the work of the Mission is being inhibited by a lack of funds on the ground. It would be helpful to have some indication from Mr. Annabi of the current position on expenditure from the United Nations Trust Fund. We understand that although some $20 million has been pledged, spending has so far been only a small proportion of that. We need also to ensure that disbursement is proceeding apace from the World Bank trust fund. We hope that UNTAET, the Secretariat and others involved can work to identify the barriers to disbursement, and we would be very open to whatever can be done to streamline the procedures so that more of the money can be spent more quickly.

I have to say that recently there has been a sense on the ground of — well, it would be an exaggeration to say bureaucracy run riot, but certainly the bureaucratic impediments to getting things done seem to be on the increase rather than the reverse. Of course, a lot of these procedures are not within the Council's area of responsibility, but, for our part, we stand ready to do what we can to help reduce such obstacles while of course retaining sufficient checks on expenditure.

It would also be helpful to know whether there is anything more that could be done to ensure that UNTAET has the specialist staff it needs to do some of the things it has to do by way of building up infrastructure, developing governmental capacity and so forth. As a member of a diplomatic service renowned for its reliance on generalists, I have to say that is a good thing, but there are limits to the extent to which they can deal with some specialist issues where obviously technical expertise is required and necessary. It is particularly important to try to make progress on both funding and capacity before next month's donor conference in Lisbon. I am sure that the importance of that meeting will not be lost on any of us around this table.

I would also welcome the Secretariat's comments on its longer-term vision for United Nations engagement in East Timor. During our last briefing Mr. Annabi very helpfully mentioned the series of benchmarks or objectives that would be necessary before independence could be reached. As I said at that time, we have to maintain a careful balance between not pushing too hard and not pushing hard enough. I am not sure that "push" is quite the right verb to use, but what is important is that as East Timor moves to independence it should have adequate capacity to cope with independence in governance, governmental services, security, democratic institutions and a whole host of things.

I think the work that the Secretariat has already done in mapping out an exit strategy, to put it a little crudely, is very useful. But there is a need to develop timelines to ensure that the mission completes its job in the right timescale and in the right way. It would be very helpful to have any comments that Mr. Annabi might wish to offer on the future shape of UNTAET or indeed on the United Nations role in East Timor post-UNTAET.

I want to conclude my intervention at this briefing in the same way that I concluded my intervention last time. None of what I have said is meant to be criticism. I want to pay tribute to the quite remarkable job that UNTAET has done on the ground and that those backstopping UNTAET have done in the Secretariat in New York. They deserve our congratulations and our thanks.

Ms. Soderberg (United States of America): I want once again to commend Assistant Secretary-General Annabi and his team, particularly the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Sergio Vieira de Mello, for a historic job that they are performing under very difficult circumstances in East Timor. This has been one of the very difficult challenges the United Nations has undertaken, and I think by all accounts they are doing a stellar job under very difficult circumstances. So we pay tribute to them once again.

I think the nature of the discussion today is in sharp contrast to what we were discussing only a few months ago here. The task of the United Nations is often to give the people of the world what President Clinton has often referred to as the chance to live the quiet miracle of a normal life, something many have been denied. While in the past few months, and certainly in the difficult months of last summer before and after the referendum and the violence that ensued, we were dealing with crises in life-saving situations, the question of militias and intimidation and all the problems that have resulted from difficulties surrounding last fall's events, today the events are shifting to the more normal tasks of how to rebuild a country, how to get the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in there and how to get investors in there to begin to trade and integrate the economy of East Timor into the normal trading systems and normal economic systems. I think the simple nature of that shift in a discussion is a tribute first and foremost to the people of East Timor, who are pulling together and trying to move their country forward after a number of very difficult decades. I think the United Nations is working with them hand-in-hand in trying to move that forward in a way that we all need to commend.

The Nobel laureate José Ramos Horta, who has been working on behalf of the people of East Timor for many years, is here in the United States. We had the honour of speaking with him this morning, and I was struck by the nature of that conversation, talking about the normal functions of a government as opposed to a people in crisis. He deserves great credit for moving things forward. The more the international community and the United Nations can do to ensure that the situation in East Timor moves in that direction as quickly as possible, that will certainly help the people of East Timor rebuild their society.

I think the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) has made very substantial progress in establishing elements of a civil administration. There are obviously very frustrating delays in initiating projects from the UNTAET and the World Bank trust funds and in ensuring that the necessary personnel with the appropriate skills are in the field. In our briefing on 27 April, Assistant Secretary-General Annabi specifically mentioned the positive effect of our Government's temporary employment projects through the Agency for International Development. We have been trying to create temporary bilateral programmes to fill an immediate need while working to get the comprehensive United Nations and World Bank employment-generating projects on line. I encourage other Governments to look at ways that they could help in that. I think, as Ambassador Eldon mentioned, the World Bank review conference in Lisbon and the subsequent donors' conference will be a major point of reference for discussing these issues, but they will also hopefully bring tangible resources that certainly are much in need.

In previous briefings we have been fairly blunt in some of our concerns about the security situation on the ground with the militias and the failure of the Indonesian Government to appropriately rein in some of them. I think it has to be said that the Indonesian armed forces (TNI) have subsequently made efforts to end cooperation with the militias. We remain concerned about the need to permanently resolve the situation of the remaining refugees and to break up the militias definitively. It is worth pointing out that progress has been made on that. We commend that progress and want to continue to see it reinforced and made a permanent situation. Any backsliding into the previous concerns would obviously be of major concern to the Security Council. There are still militias on the ground, however, and I think that we have to continue to watch the situation so that it does not evolve into a threat in future that would cause many of us difficulties.

The Security Council acted very quickly in endorsing the need for UNTAET to assist in the floods in West Timor, and I think our actions there are a model for international cooperation to help in a humanitarian situation that assisted a number of refugee families in their decision to return to East Timor.

The decision to send these UNTAET helicopters, I think, was a concrete way that the UNTAET operation could assist all of the people of East Timor, and it enabled us to work in a very cooperative effort with Indonesia that will assist in developing further ties and cooperation. Also, I would commend the Secretary-General's decision to ask Mr. Vieira de Mello to travel to Fiji to deliver a strong message of concern over the situation there. That is obviously a situation that we are following very closely. We have called for the immediate release of the hostages and

certainly urge all the people of Fiji to resolve this crisis in a peaceful manner and in accordance with Fiji's Constitution.

On the issue of civilian police, I think that in East Timor they need to have the means to carry out their responsibilities effectively. In some areas, including in Dili and the western districts, the civilian police are currently armed, and we continue to believe that this policy should be considered throughout the territory of East Timor. I know that this is something that the United Nations has under discussion; I think it is important to have a consistent policy throughout the territory, particularly in areas where there are special needs on the ground.

UNTAET is now beginning to establish a functioning judiciary, and this is an area that we have been following with particular interest. I will repeat one story just to show how far things have come. There is now a new East Timor judicial system and a newly trained judge presiding over a hearing about the legality of continued detention of a Falintil member who is accused of killing a militia member on 22 September. This hearing was attended by 50 people, local and international, journalists and family members. To us it was a normal judicial function that would happen in any normal situation. José Ramos Horta noted that this was the first case of an East Timorese judge presiding in an East Timorese courtroom in nearly 500 years. I think that that small story represents just how far individuals have been able to make a difference in East Timor, and the United Nations should be rightly proud in noting its accomplishments.

In closing, I would just add that the people of East Timor are now actively discussing with the international community, the World Bank and possible investors how to develop their own country. I think it is up to the international community to remain engaged in East Timor — just because it is not on the front pages any more does not mean that there are not broad needs there, including for the sustained, continued engagement of the international community, albeit in the more traditional senses of trade, economic policies, investment and judicial functions. It is a tribute to the people of UNTAET and the people of East Timor that the conversation is shifting towards those types of day-to-day activities and away from the crises that we were dealing with just a few months ago.

Once again, I commend the United Nations for its efforts.

Mr. Teixeira da Silva (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to associate itself with the two preceding speakers in thanking Mr. Annabi and also in pointing out that we are quite aware of the magnitude and the difficulty of the tasks the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) is facing, as well as of the undeniable progress that has been made. The pace may seem slow, but this can obviously be explained by the state in which East Timor finds itself and also by the difficulties of mobilizing both human and financial resources. This is particularly true since after the tragic events of last year, East Timor is no longer on the front pages of the newspapers or seen in broadcast news, precisely because there is no tragedy. But the problem here is that international attention and interest have again declined.

I have two sets of comments and questions for Mr. Annabi, in addition to those already made by the two preceding speakers. I will address the security issue first. Mr. Annabi spoke of a crime rate that remains high: is this common crime, economic crime, or acts that have a political motive, committed by isolated elements or by organized anti-independence militia elements?

My second question regarding security is about the division of labour between the army and the UNTAET police. This is a problem we have faced in other operations — I am thinking in particular of Kosovo — where in stabilizing some situations the line may seem a bit fuzzy between the competence of international police and the competence of military units.

Regarding incidents that have taken place, I heard Mr. Annabi mention police intervention. What is the particular task of the military troops of UNTAET, and are there clear criteria for the division of tasks between the international police and units that are specifically military? Any clarification here would be most welcome. We note that UNTAET decided to reduce the military contingent by 500 men by October; that seems to us a step in the right direction. Beyond October, are there other plans to further reduce the military element, or is it thought that there is a need not to move too quickly in view of the situation? But to correctly assess that, we need to have a rather clear view of the division

of labour between the police units and the military units.

My last point in this area: could Mr. Annabi provide more information regarding the training of local police, since, indeed, the goal here was to have local police take over from the international police units?

My second comment is to supplement the question raised by Ambassador Eldon concerning the problem of financing the UNTAET Trust Fund and the World Bank trust fund. There is a third pillar here which we must not forget: the peacekeeping budget, the special budget of UNTAET. Any indications regarding the state of contributions and the gap between the necessary budget and contributions would be most welcome, because above all this mission needs to function. Does the present state of contributions not represent an obstacle to the proper functioning of this mission?

Mr. Vámos-Goldman (Canada): I would like to join previous speakers in thanking Mr. Annabi for his briefing.

First, I would like to express Canada's condolences over the lives lost in the recent flooding in East and West Timor and to congratulate the joint efforts of aid agencies, the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the Indonesian Government.

Turning to the issue of refugees, we are encouraged by the decision of the Indonesian Government to establish a transitional period beyond its 31 March 2000 deadline for the return of East Timorese refugees in West Timor. Canada believes that the early and voluntary return of these refugees or their permanent resettlement in Indonesia is necessary for their own security and for the stability of both East and West Timor.

While refugees continue to register to return to East Timor, we are concerned by the increasingly slow pace of this process resulting from the frailty of essential services and infrastructures in returnee communities, the unresolved question of pensions owed to former East Timorese civil servants and the continuing presence of militia and related misinformation campaigns in the camps of West Timor.

We welcome the recent establishment by the Indonesian Government of a panel to investigate the allegations of human rights violations in East Timor raised by the Indonesian Commission of Inquiry into Human Rights Violations in East Timor and by United Nations reports. It is important that the findings of these reports be investigated and prosecuted by independent and impartial judicial processes, consistent with international legal standards. It is equally important that those responsible for atrocities in East Timor be held accountable. In this regard, we also welcome the recent memorandum of understanding between UNTAET and the Indonesian Government, which provides for mutual assistance in investigating human rights violations.

Finally, like previous speakers, I should like to note the progress made by UNTAET to date in spite of difficulties on the ground. Canada supports UNTAET's strategy of consulting and involving the East Timorese closely in the rebuilding and administration of the territory. In this regard, we are encouraged by the recent decision to establish district advisory councils, which will bring together representatives from East Timorese civil society and the United Nations Transitional Administration at the local level.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): I thank you wholeheartedly, Sir, for scheduling this open briefing on East Timor. We thank Mr. Annabi for his comprehensive briefing on the latest situation in that territory. It shows clearly that, since his last briefing, we have again covered some ground, which gives us reason for satisfaction. We would therefore begin by expressing our deep appreciation for the United Nations team in East Timor, led by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Sergio Vieira de Mello. We, in fact, thought that it would be possible for him to come and brief us this time.

On the return of refugees, recent reports say that, since early May, there has been a drastic drop in the number of refugees returning to East Timor. What is more disturbing is that the ostensible reason is the harassment of refugees inside East Timor. We would like to recall here that we attached particular importance to this issue in all our statements in the past. It is crucial to ensure that the process of the settling down of refugees be smooth in order to instil confidence in them and also positively to contribute to the question of national reconciliation. Everything should be done to encourage the refugees to return, and that should be done on the basis of real progress on the ground in areas of concern to them.

In the context of encouraging disparate militia elements to disband, we would like to welcome the initiative taken by the Government of Indonesia to ask these soldiers either to join its resettlement programmes or to resign and return to East Timor. Making the choice very clear to these trouble-mongers is a very positive attitude which we believe would facilitate the United Nations task considerably.

With regard to civil and judicial administration, we note with appreciation the signs of effective administration that have been apparent in recent days. The opening of the civil service campus and the commencement of training courses for the East Timorese civil service are very important developments and we commend the efforts of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) behind them. We believe that the regulation recently adopted on the establishment of foreign government representative offices will open up opportunities for more interaction with the international community and facilitate communication and understanding of the situation on the ground in East Timor. We are happy to note that the Administration has started the collection of customs duties, which will help to improve the financial situation. The first public review of a detention case is also a welcome sign that the judiciary has started functioning.

The recent extensive flooding in West Timor presented UNTAET with a difficult situation. The Council has agreed with the recommendation of the Secretary-General that UNTAET should respond to the request of the Government of Indonesia for assistance. As we mentioned at that time, this operation and the personnel involved should be covered by UNTAET's mandate. For UNTAET, it would be one more step towards closer cooperation with the Government of Indonesia, if that is so desired.

We welcome the preparatory work for next month's donor conference in Lisbon. We are also encouraged to note that the various employment-generating projects are contributing to the redress of the unemployment situation, as reported by Mr. Annabi.

Finally, the law and order situation remains an enduring concern to my delegation, as it adversely impacts on the return of refugees and the opportunities for development programmes.

Mr. Granovsky (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset, we wish to express our satisfaction that the holding of regular open briefings on East Timor is becoming part of the Security Council's customary practice. We believe that this is fully justified in the light of the situation in the territory and by the attention being paid to this question by the international community.

Our assessment of the development of the situation in East Timor and the activity of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) jibes with the analyses contained in statements made by members of the Council. In the interests of saving time, I shall not repeat them. I should like to add only that, together with the entire international community, we have followed with concern reports on the development of the emergency situation arising from the floods in West Timor. We express our condolences in connection with the loss of life and believe that we must express our satisfaction with the assistance rendered by UNTAET to the authorities of Indonesia in overcoming the consequences of that natural disaster.

The activity of the United Nations in East Timor is a serious test of its effectiveness and potential in resolving various kinds of problems. We pay due tribute to the successful efforts of UNTAET, and personally to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello.

Mr. Mársico (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, I wish to thank Mr. Annabi for the comprehensive and useful information he has given us. We note with satisfaction the positive evolution of the situation in East Timor, in particular as regards security. It should be stressed that, since early March, no incidents have been recorded along the frontier of the territory and that the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) has succeeded in developing good cooperation with the military authorities of Indonesia. It is also good to see the growing involvement of the East Timorese leaders in the decision-making process on the future of the territory. We believe that this initiative on the part of UNTAET will make it possible to create conditions for the development of the essential institutions and political framework for the independent life of East Timor.

In this context, I would like once again to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Argentine Republic for the excellent performance by Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello and all the personnel of UNTAET. In addition, we would like to congratulate the Indonesian authorities on their cooperative attitude towards the United Nations, a clear indication of which was the judicial process initiated against those responsible for the lamentable violent events that occurred in 1999. We trust that this positive trend will also help solve the refugee problem in West Timor.

With regard to the current situation on the island of Timor, I would like to express the solidarity and sorrow of the people and the Government of Argentina in respect of the serious flooding that has recently occurred. In this connection, we hope that UNTAET's assistance, and that of international humanitarian agencies, will help alleviate the suffering of those affected. It is also our hope that United Nations assistance will contribute to clearing up misinformation and preconceptions that apparently continue to exist in some refugee camps. This would make it easier for the people there to return to East Timor.

Lastly, I would like to ask Mr. Annabi about developments in the talks concerning the future of the Armed Forces for the National Liberation of East Timor (Falintil), especially in the light of the position of the leaders of East Timor regarding the creation of armed forces for a future independent State.

Mr. Mohammad Kamal (Malaysia): Like previous speakers, I would like to thank Mr. Hédi Annabi for the comprehensive update on the situation in East Timor which he has provided us this afternoon.

Malaysia continues to believe that the United Nations mission in East Timor continues to be a very difficult one. We recognize the daunting task that the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the international community face and the frustration that is exacerbated by, among other things, the very high expectations of the East Timorese people. UNTAET is, of course, doing excellent work and enjoys our full support. In this regard, we would like in particular to commend Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello and his staff for the high level of professionalism that they have demonstrated in implementing the difficult mandate assigned to them.

We note the recent developments in East Timor in laying the foundation for the future development of the country. Among these was the successful broadcast of the first programme on UNTAET television on 18 May. We also note that the draft of the broadcast media regulation was introduced in the National Consultative Council on the same day. At the same time, we welcome the reopening late last month in Dili of the East Timor Postal Service, which is part of the ongoing reconstruction of East Timor. These developments are further steps towards creating a sense of ownership among the people of East Timor.

We wish to express our appreciation to UNTAET for its prompt response in dealing with the recent emergency in West Timor as a result of the extensive flooding there. We note that UNTAET dispatched two helicopters on 18 May to evacuate the flood victims and to deliver humanitarian relief supplies. In this regard, we would like to underscore the goodwill displayed by the Indonesian Government in its cooperation with United Nations agencies to alleviate the hardships caused to the East Timorese refugees and to facilitate the coordination of relief efforts due to the floods in East Nusa Tenggara.

We further note that, despite some remaining difficulties, we are gratified to have just heard from Mr. Annabi that the overall security situation in East Timor is stable and that militia activities in the border areas have declined. However, we remain concerned at continuing reports of violence and crime in East Timor, and we find this situation unsettling. In particular, we wish to express our deep concern about reports of religious violence and the harassment of ethnic and religious minorities in East Timor, as Mr. Annabi just mentioned in his briefing. We call on UNTAET to take all necessary measures to protect these minorities. We urge the East Timorese leaders to prevent the recurrence of such violence and harassment, to work assiduously towards national reconciliation among the East Timorese and to inculcate the spirit of tolerance, trust and harmony among the population.

We are encouraged by UNTAET's decision to declare a policy of zero tolerance for individuals carrying objects that could be used as weapons, after the violent disturbances in late April in Dili. We also wish to welcome the holding of a two-day meeting in Jogjakarta on 24-25 May between the representatives of the Indonesian Government and UNTAET to discuss issues related to assets claims and liability, archives and other outstanding issues from the last round-table

negotiations, such as pensions, border issues and the establishment of a joint border commission.

We note the strain the refugee crisis is putting on the local population in terms of overcrowding and occupation of land in West Timor. Malaysia believes that one of the most viable solutions to the refugee crisis must include the possibility of repatriation. We welcome the decision of the Government of Indonesia to improve the distribution of food rations and basic services in the camps in West Timor. We also wish to welcome the opening of the first land border crossing between East Timor and Indonesia on 3 May, which is another positive step towards normalcy.

In conclusion, it is our firm belief that the Council must continue to regularly follow developments in the situation in East Timor and to continue this format of open briefing, which my delegation firmly believes will also benefit the larger membership of our Organization on this very important issue.

Mr. van Walsum (Netherlands): We, too, would like to thank Assistant Secretary-General Annabi for a very useful and informative briefing. Before commenting on some of the information we received from him today, I would like once again to express my delegation's appreciation for all the work that is being done by the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) under very difficult circumstances.

Let me begin by focusing on West Timor. My delegation is concerned that many thousands of refugees still remain there. I have a few specific questions and would be grateful if Mr. Annabi could give me equally specific replies, although I understand that may not always be the case. My first question concerns the process of the registration of refugees in the camps of West Timor. We would like to know exactly how this is carried out. Is the registration merely a matter of counting the people, or will the refugees be asked where in East Timor they are from, whether they wish to return and, if so, why they have not yet done so? The last question is of obvious relevance.

My next question here is when the registration process will be completed, and when its results will be available.

Many of the remaining refugees were presumably pro-Indonesian. Could the Secretariat elaborate on the efforts made to convince these people that it is safe for them to return, and tell us to what extent these efforts have the desired effect? Of course, this leads to the preliminary question of what is being done in East Timor to ensure that it is indeed safe for these people to return?

It is of deep concern to the Netherlands that, according to our information, militia activity and intimidation continue unabated, in particular in Kupang, where the presence of East Timorese and Indonesian military and militia leaders brought back from East Timor is considerable. Apparently, personnel of the Indonesian armed forces (TNI) are still not reintegrated into the normal military command and control structures, but remain stuck in the refugee camps. We are convinced that the central authorities in Jakarta are trying to rein in the militias, and we appreciate the difficulties they may have in seeing their instructions fully implemented on the ground. Nevertheless, the Government of Indonesia has to step up its efforts in this regard. In reminding Indonesia of its responsibilities in West Timor, we are not interfering in its domestic affairs.

Let me repeat the gist of paragraph 12 of resolution 1272 (1999), which was adopted exactly seven months ago today. On that occasion, the Security Council stressed that it was the responsibility of the Indonesian authorities to take immediate and effective measures to ensure the safe return of refugees in West Timor and other parts of Indonesia to East Timor, the security of refugees, and the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee camps and settlements, in particular by curbing the violent and intimidatory activities of the militias there. All of that continues to be valid today, with the exception of the word "immediate", which obviously has lost its meaning in a resolution that is seven months old.

On the positive side, it is encouraging to hear that cooperation between the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the TNI along the border is developing satisfactorily. However, the Council should be cautious in drawing from this the conclusion that as a result the military component of UNTAET may now be downsized. The Netherlands is of the opinion that, as part of the process leading to a possible decision to that effect, the Council should receive a separate briefing on the military and security

situation in East Timor, including the state of the militias in West Timor. On the basis of that briefing the Council could then decide on the strength of the military component required to enable UNTAET to carry out that part of its mandate which concerns the provision of security throughout the territory of East Timor.

This is an important matter for my delegation. In October, when we discussed the wording of resolution 1272 (1999), the Netherlands strongly defended the figure of up to 8,950 troops, as had been recommended by the Secretary-General. On 27 April, in the Security Council, Mr. Annabi informed us that UNTAET was then reviewing the possibility of reducing the strength of its military component, and promised us that the result of that review would be brought to the attention of the Security Council. Today, we have not heard anything that could be described as the result of the review, but instead we have been informed of the decision to reduce the strength of the military component from 8,396 to 7,896 by October.

We had expected a somewhat different procedure. If the peaceful conditions in the eastern part of East Timor allow for some downsizing, there is also the option of relocation which could have been considered. At any rate, my delegation feels that the Security Council should be given an opportunity to consider the whole military and security situation, and we are looking forward to a specific briefing, either in another open meeting or in consultations of the whole.

We are looking forward to receiving the independent expert study currently under preparation on a possible national East Timorese defence force. When can we expect it? Apparently, there have been questions as to whether it is appropriate for the United Nations to become involved in the establishment of a military force. For its part, the Netherlands would consider it entirely appropriate and in keeping with UNTAET's mandate of nation-building in East Timor if the United Nations also dealt with the establishment of a military force for the purpose of self-defence.

Of course, expert assistance by friendly countries could be sought, including perhaps that of some countries members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, and not automatically excluding Indonesia. We are very well aware of the sensitivities involved, and these should of course be taken into account. But we should also realize that an independent East Timor will eventually establish a military force, and it is better to have this done at a time and in a manner which give the international community the opportunity to ensure that the development of that force, like that of the other indigenous East Timorese structures for security, conforms to the standards of civilian control, democratic accountability and observance of international human rights norms and standards.

A measure of the extent to which those standards are met by those security structures could be included in the benchmarks which, according to Mr. Annabi, could serve to gauge East Timor's fitness for independence. Are the East Timorese leaders in full agreement with those benchmarks? Does the Secretariat intend to develop the benchmarks further?

Finally, having mentioned the military cooperation between UNTAET and the TNI, I should like also to address the issue of cooperation in the area of human rights and legal affairs on the basis of the Memorandum of Understanding signed on 7 April. The Netherlands would be very interested to hear how this cooperation is taking shape in practice, in particular with regard to investigating and prosecuting human rights violations. Recently, the Indonesian Attorney-General, Mr. Darusman, stated that the first trials would take place perhaps as early as this month.

Miss Durrant (Jamaica): Like previous speakers, I wish to thank the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Annabi, for his briefing on the current situation in East Timor. We commend the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello, and the staff of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET).

We note in particular that over the past few months UNTAET has directed its focus and redoubled its efforts to ensure that the East Timorese people are more and more involved in the process of rehabilitation and reconstruction. This, in my delegation's view, is the only path to the sustainability of institutions in East Timor and to ensuring that the requisite local capacity and ownership are created.

We welcome in particular the recent opening of the civil service campus, which will provide training and which in fact houses the Public Service Commission. We will follow closely the progress of training in basic administration and in leadership and supervisory skills. UNTAET must also be commended

for having moved swiftly to establish the administrative units and departments that could form the basis for the future East Timorese Government agencies.

At the same time, my delegation believes that care has to be taken to ensure that the structures will not be too costly for an independent East Timor to operate. It is, after all, a small territory, with fewer than 1 million persons, and a mostly agricultural population.

We have been told by Mr. Annabi that the law and order situation has improved. Nevertheless, the role and effectiveness of the civilian police component of UNTAET in maintaining law and order and developing a credible, professional and impartial East Timorese police force remains critical. We therefore urge that top priority be given to the quick and full deployment of this component of the mission.

My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express our condolences to the families of those who lost their lives in the recent flooding. This flooding, we note, also affected the refugee camps in West Timor and a total of some 50,000 persons. UNTAET and the humanitarian agencies must be commended for their speedy response to the crisis. We also commend the Government of Indonesia for its actions and note its efforts in coordinating relief.

The number of returns of refugees to East Timor now stands at more than 161,000. While the number of returns seems to demonstrate that there is a growing level of confidence in the situation in East Timor and that the fear for personal safety may have diminished, it is important that the conditions for peaceful and safe returns be created, if those still in the refugee camps are to return. This, we believe, is a significant factor in the process of rehabilitation.

The employment situation in East Timor continues to be of concern to my delegation. We note that the transitional employment programme has provided employment for a number of persons in the 13 districts of East Timor, in a wide range of areas. We are encouraged that this initiative has generated employment, but remain concerned that the employment initiative must focus on long-term rehabilitation. The quick-fix approach will, in the long-term, leave gaps and generate problems.

My delegation would be interested to hear about the progress in the small-enterprise projects spearheaded by the World Bank, which envisaged providing loans to East Timorese enterprises and reviving the local economy. Like the delegation of the United Kingdom, we would also like to hear more about the trust fund for the East Timor programme, particularly in the area of agriculture. We also welcome the health sector programme, which provides support to the Interim Health Authority and which will revamp the health system and develop appropriate policies and systems.

Turning to another subject, we continue to believe that those responsible for gross violations of human rights in East Timor must be brought to justice. In view of the information provided by Mr. Annabi, it is clear that UNTAET must continue its investigative work and its monitoring of human rights violations. We also wish to thank the Government of Indonesia for the cooperation it has demonstrated with UNTAET. We hope that the Lisbon donors' conference, which is scheduled for 21 to 23 June, will attract the funds required, and we wish to thank those Governments that have already contributed to East Timor's development.

In conclusion, my delegation acknowledges that the challenges in East Timor are indeed great, but remarkable progress has been achieved in a few short months. The process there is a gradual one, at the end of which a new, independent and viable country will emerge. We will therefore continue to support the work of UNTAET and to show our solidarity with the people of East Timor.

Mr. Andjaba (Namibia): I wish to thank Mr. Annabi for his useful and informative briefing on the situation in East Timor. My delegation appreciates the continuing progress in the work of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) regarding the administration, rebuilding and rehabilitation of East Timor.

We note with appreciation that the National Consultative Council has been carrying out its functions. We would be most grateful to hear from Mr. Annabi specifically on how progress in national reconciliation among the people of East Timor is proceeding. We believe that this is one of the very important elements of the peace process in East Timor.

We commend in particular the personal efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello. The inauguration of the Civil Service Academy is a very positive achievement,

since the Academy will play a vital role in the future development of the human resources of East Timor. Similarly, the establishment of the first television broadcast in East Timor and the opening of the first land-border crossing between East Timor and Indonesia are positive developments. The important role of the media during peacekeeping operations cannot be overemphasized.

The safe return of refugees from West to East Timor remains one of the main outstanding matters regarding the situation in East Timor. It is unfortunate that the militias are continuing their campaign in the refugee camps in West Timor. We regret the large number of deaths and widespread destruction caused by the intense flooding that continues to ravage West Timor. It is unfortunate that at this crucial juncture nature should add to the deaths and large-scale displacements. We express our profound sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

We commend UNTAET for its efforts to rescue and assist the victims of these floods. We trust that enough resources will be made available to salvage the situation. In particular, we wish to echo the importance of next month's Lisbon donors' conference.

Mr. Ben Mustapha (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): We join other members of the Council in thanking Assistant Secretary-General Annabi for his comprehensive statement.

Despite the efforts made by the Indonesian authorities in cooperation with the United Nations to resolve all of the problems related to the return of the refugees, this issue remains a source of concern and continues to contribute to instability in the region.

The recent floods that struck the south-eastern part of West Timor and claimed hundreds of victims from among the East Timorese refugees in West Timor, including women and children, have demonstrated the need to speed up the return of refugees and above all for their reintegration into East Timorese society in good conditions.

We welcome the good cooperation between UNTAET and the Indonesian Government, as well as the specialized agencies in the field, which has enabled the relocation of the affected East Timorese refugees to other areas and the delivery of humanitarian assistance. We also welcome the calming of the security situation, in itself an encouraging sign for the advancement of economic activity and has a positive impact on public order, which remains a delicate area that requires follow-up on a daily basis.

There is also a need to emphasize UNTAET's efforts and achievements in the area of creating jobs to meet a growing need for employment. In this regard, it is important to lay down a general policy in this sector that will make it possible to ensure the participation of the East Timorese in the establishment of an economic environment that is conducive to peace.

We believe that the economic aspect is one of the major priorities to which particular attention must be paid by the international community, the donor countries and the international financial institutions. The post-conflict period and its humanitarian and economic needs require intensive efforts so that peace can be established for the long term. We welcome the donors' conference that will take place next June in Lisbon, which will make it possible, we hope, to free up additional financial resources very much needed for the improvement of living conditions and the reconstruction of the country's infrastructure.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my delegation's congratulations to UNTAET for all the efforts it is undertaking in all areas, despite the difficulties in the field.

Mr. Krokhmal (Ukraine): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important meeting of the Security Council, and thanks also to Mr. Hédi Annabi for his comprehensive and informative briefing on the activities of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the situation in East Timor during the past month. The situation has been extremely difficult following the emergency that resulted from extensive flooding. It was with deepest regret that my delegation heard the reports of the tragic loss of human life and the extensive destruction of property in West and East Timor. UNTAET responded urgently and provided assistance to the Indonesian Government's relief efforts. We would like to express our appreciation to all those involved in these operations.

The first issue I would like to touch upon is the refugee situation. My delegation is pleased to know that the total number of returnees to East Timor had exceeded 160,000 by the end of last month. By the number of those who have decided to return, one could measure, in fact, the progress made towards regaining

normality in East Timor. However, we are concerned that, according to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, repatriation from West Timor has decreased over the past few weeks, presumably due to increasing reports of harassment of those returnees inside East Timor. In this regard, my delegation underlines the importance of continued efforts on the part of UNTAET and the other international agencies concerned to facilitate the return of an estimated 125,000 refugees who remain in West Timor to their places of origin in safety and dignity. Clearly, all these people have to be given an opportunity to determine freely where they want to go and settle.

More often than not, economic reconstruction forms an integral part of peacekeeping. We believe that the economic and social conditions in East Timor are areas which clearly warrant further and more focused action. We are encouraged to hear from Mr. Annabi that the Secretariat works actively with the World Bank and other financial institutions to accelerate the pace of both contributions received by to the United Nations Trust Fund and the disbursements on the ground.

The start of a number of rehabilitation projects has been mentioned. However, it is disappointing that the progress achieved in this respect has sometimes been very slow. Of course, this task is a complex one which also requires essential input from all the partners. We would be interested to be briefed on the grant agreement recently concluded with the World Bank to help revamp the health sector. We believe that this project should be given priority attention.

The capacity of the entire political process in East Timor will be extremely limited until the local population is involved in various matters of governance. In our view, UNTAET acts with this perspective in mind. There have been many experiences of successful cooperation at the local level between the East Timorese and the international presence in East Timor since the district advisory councils were set up. Ukraine highly appreciates the important work the Administration continues to perform in the development of the private sector along with setting up the civil service. In this context, we welcome the inauguration of the Civil Service Academy.

Turning to the security issue, the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding on security, boundary-crossing, the passage of refugees and the provision of humanitarian assistance along the border between East and West Timor seems to be keeping pace with the expectations of the international community. The number of major incidents, the briefing indicates, has declined significantly. The security situation is generally stable. However, some outstanding issues remain. In this context, I would like especially to stress the significant role played by the civilian police component of UNTAET. The basic task of the civilian police — to maintain a security presence throughout the country and in this way law and order in East Timor — is essential to carrying out the UNTAET mandate. We would be grateful if the Secretariat could comment in a more detailed manner on the recent developments regarding the indigenous police force.

The international community has invested heavily in the reconciliation and reconstruction process in East Timor. But even more extensive international involvement will still be needed in East Timor. Ukraine will remain actively engaged.

Mr. Keita (Mali) (*spoke in French*): First, I wish to express to the Secretariat my delegation's great appreciation for the information provided and to reiterate our support for the efforts made by the Secretary-General in the context of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET).

At the briefing on East Timor on 27 April, we were able to find out about the development of the situation in the country, which was generally positive. Nevertheless, questions such as the return of refugees, border security, the reconstruction of the country and employment were urgent challenges for UNTAET.

The information provided today on what has happened since 27 April shows that once again UNTAET is moving on the right path and has embarked on a gradual process. At the economic level, my delegation welcomes the increase in the number of private companies, which today has reached a total of 2000. This favours the decline in crime, which was a result of people being out of work. At this security level, we welcome the establishment of a Joint Border Commission and encourage UNTAET to pursue the training of local police to cope with persistent crime and to maintain law and order.

At the political level, Mr. Annabi mentioned earlier the creation of political parties and the beginning of political activities. My delegation,

therefore, would like Mr. Annabi to give us more information on these two points. What do the Timorese think about these political parties, and how do they see independence in general? We feel that it is not superfluous to have public awareness campaigns directed towards the population in order to avoid passions or violence related to such events.

UNTAET is arriving at a crossroads. Apart from the reconstruction and stabilization of East Timor and establishing security there, it must resolutely embark on the process of establishing the various institutions so as to place the country on the path of independence. The involvement of the Timorese people at this point should be decisive.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of China.

As are others, we also are grateful to Assistant Secretary-General Annabi for his briefing. The Chinese delegation is relieved to learn that the situation in East Timor remains stable. We also would like to pay a special tribute to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Vieira de Mello, and to his staff for the great deal of work that they have accomplished under difficult circumstances.

The Chinese Ambassador to Indonesia recently visited East Timor. We are under the impression that the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) has made tangible progress in the maintenance of law and order, enacting laws, rebuilding housing and infrastructure, creating employment and in training and capacity-building. We support its work in these areas.

The most pressing problem in East Timor at present is the serious unemployment situation. The continuation of this problem will have a negative impact on the security situation there. We hope that greater efforts can be made by UNTAET in creating employment opportunities.

The East Timorese people have high expectations for the United Nations. When these expectations are not met, it is understandable that people begin to lose patience. The United Nations cannot remain indifferent to the frustration and disappointment experienced by the East Timorese people. It is necessary for UNTAET to take measures to allow faster participation of more local people in the transitional work, so that they can learn how to govern their own country.

I resume my function as President of the Council. I shall now give the floor to Mr. Annabi to respond to the questions raised.

Mr. Annabi: There have been a lot of questions raised by members of the Council, and I will try to answer as best I can. I want to apologize in advance if I do not reply with the degree of detail that some delegations might expect. This is my third briefing to the Council today, and it is not always easy for me to master every detail on every operation on a given day.

I was asked about the status of the United Nations Trust Fund. Contributions to this Trust Fund amount today to $28.6 million. A total of $14.1 million out of these $28.6 have either been spent, meaning disbursed, or committed to various priority activities, including the reconstruction of public buildings, which is of course a very important requirement given the level of destruction that took place in the wake of the consultation last year.

As regards the situation of the World Bank Trust Fund, that Fund has received a total of $38.4 million out of the $147 million that were pledged during the Tokyo conference at the end of last year. The level of expenditure remains low and represents about $2 million at this time, but now that the Bank has completed the general procedures regarding the initiation of some of the projects that are foreseen, we expect that the disbursement will increase fairly quickly in the coming weeks and months. In fact, a number of agreements with the World Bank totalling $30 million to $40 million are near to being finalized in the health, agriculture and education sectors, where specific projects have been identified. We also understand that projects to be funded under the first instalment of the $29.8 million infrastructure project of the World Bank, which was agreed in March with the Asian Development Bank, are underway, and that the first emergency road contracts, representing some $4.5 million, will be mobilized in June, next month.

Finally, on this particular issue, let me say that we hope that the Lisbon donor meeting, which will take place next month, will provide a good opportunity to take stock of where we are in terms of implementing these rehabilitation and reconstruction projects and to assess what further steps will need to be taken. I also wish to assure members of the Council that we have

done our best at this end to try and cut through some of the red tape to facilitate disbursements. In fact, the Comptroller had authorized the World Bank to borrow money from the United Nations Trust Fund pending completion of its own procedures regarding the initiation of the implementation of some of the projects that were scheduled to be funded from its own Trust Fund.

The second important issue raised was the issue of benchmarks on the path to independence and the longer-term vision of UNTAET in this regard. I mentioned in my briefing last month some of the benchmarks that have been identified and on which consultations with the East Timorese are continuing. I think it is important to understand that the implementation of these benchmarks touches on very important issues for the East Timorese. Some of them have strong views on some of these issues and we need, of course, to respect their views so that, when we do come forward with a more elaborated presentation of these benchmarks, we do so with their support and cooperation.

Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello will probably be able to come to New York following the Lisbon donor meeting next month. I believe that we, and he in particular, will have more to say on this subject at that time. But again, I want to repeat that these issues cannot be decided independently by UNTAET and that we need to work with the East Timorese and to respect their views. I think that an important timeline in this regard will be the congress of the National Council of Timorese Resistance, which is expected to be held in August and which, I think and hope, will help the Timorese to come to a more precise definition of their views in this regard.

The next question related to the security situation inside East Timor and the level of criminality. The question was: Is this criminality related to the economic situation and to the social dislocation which East Timor has experienced, or does it have a political character? I think the answer is that it is essentially linked to the economic situation; to the very high degree of unemployment, which stood at some 80 per cent when UNTAET was established; and to the very deep social disruption and dislocation that have resulted in the country from the events of last September.

I was also asked about the division of labour between the military component of UNTAET and the civilian police component. The division there is the same as what we have in other theatres where we are present. The police are in charge of the basic law and order functions and, in the case of East Timor as in the case of Kosovo, we have been given direct law enforcement responsibilities. At the same time, the military component provides and ensures the wider security environment in which the police component can carry out its functions. The military component can also be called upon, of course, to provide back-up to the police should situations develop with which the police are not able to cope. This is the same set-up as we have in Kosovo and Bosnia and that we have had in other peacekeeping operations.

There have also been questions on the reduction of the military component of UNTAET. As I indicated, UNTAET is proposing to carry out an initial reduction of some 500 troops between now and October, which would be pulled out of the eastern sector of East Timor, which has been fairly quiet. This fits, of course, into a wider programme, a wider plan, that would foresee, if the security situation remains stable, further reductions by next April. It is envisaged at this time that there could be a total reduction of 50 per cent of the troops in Sector East by April and a further reduction by the summer of 2001. But all of this is predicated upon a stable security situation.

UNTAET will continue to review the situation and to propose and implement reductions in other sectors if it assesses that that has become possible. We do not believe in micromanaging or directing this process from here. We believe that the force on the ground should have a reasonable degree of autonomy in this regard and the capacity to propose the necessary additional reductions in due course.

There was also a question on the current efforts of UNTAET to train the local Timorese police force. This is, of course, one of the two main tasks of the UNTAET police component, the first being to ensure the maintenance of law and order and the second being to develop an East Timorese police force that can take over from UNTAET in due course. The East Timor police college, as I may have mentioned last month, opened on 27 March and the first group of trainees is scheduled to graduate from the school on 2 June, so the process of training the future Timorese police forces is under way. Under present plans, it is foreseen that a

total of 3,000 East Timorese will have been trained and will graduate from the police school by the end of next year. In the meantime, UNTAET is also working with what is called the "police assistance group", which is composed of former East Timorese police officers who are assisting UNTAET, after being retrained as necessary.

There was also a question on the present state of payment of assessed contributions to the UNTAET budget. I must confess that I do not have that at my fingertips. There is a monthly publication issued by the comptroller that provides detailed information on the status of each peacekeeping account and can be easily consulted. What I can say is that, of course, delays in payment of assessed contributions make it difficult for us to reimburse troop contributors in a timely manner. This has been a daunting problem over the last few years because, if I may say so, troop contributors get punished twice: they go out to the field and take the risks that some of these operations have to face, and then at the same time they do not get reimbursed in a timely manner. So I can only hope that the UNTAET budget is current, but we will need to look at that monthly report.

I was also asked to provide information on the ongoing consultation and discussions between UNTAET and the National Council of Timorese Resistance (CNRT) on the future of the Armed Forces for the National Liberation of East Timor (Falintil). I mentioned last month that the East Timorese had clearly indicated the wish to have a security force in East Timor that would not be part of the police and would not be a gendarmerie-type force. In this regard, Xanana Gusmao has written to the Secretary-General, who has assured him that the United Nations would respect the decision that the East Timorese will take on how best to ensure the security of the country when it becomes independent. In other words, we have recognized that an independent East Timor will have the sovereign right to establish a security force, but at the same time it is important that, prior to the formation of such a force, its framework be defined in accordance with the principles of civilian oversight, democratic accountability, universal recruitment and international human rights norms and standards.

We also feel that a decision as to the timing, process and setting up of such a force would need to be taken in full consideration of the findings of the study that will be undertaken by the Kings College in London. The Kings College has offered to carry out a study on the possible options in this regard, and the Timorese have welcomed this initiative. This study will be conducted by a multinational team. It is expected that it will take about six weeks and will begin fairly soon. It is agreed with the Timorese that, on that basis, the various options will be considered and discussed. The Secretary-General has, of course, drawn their attention to the fact that the decision to establish a security force will have important long-term external and domestic implications that need to be viewed in the context of regional security, the future constitutional framework and its possible impact on the economic situation of the country. So this is where things stand on this issue.

As regards the registration of refugees now being carried out by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the purpose of this exercise is to have a reliable view of the exact number of refugees, the composition of the families, their occupation or former occupation and place of origin in East Timor. This will provide a data base that will be used for purposes of assistance and for the determination and promotion of durable solutions, which are, of course, either voluntary repatriation, or resettlement in West Timor or other regions of Indonesia.

On the question as to whether UNHCR will be trying to ascertain the wishes of the East Timorese, the answer is yes, UNHCR will try to do this, if and when circumstances permit. But we have to remember that the security conditions prevailing in the camps, to which I alluded in my briefing and which clearly remain precarious, do not always make that possible. UNHCR expects to complete this registration process by the end of June. UNHCR is continuing its efforts to promote voluntary repatriation on the one hand, and it is continuing, on the other hand, to discuss with the Indonesian Government and other agencies concerned the preparation of a local integration plan for those who will decide to remain in West Timor. My UNHCR colleagues tell me that they expect this plan to be ready by July of this year.

Another question relates to what is being done in East Timor to ensure that the refugees can return safely. This is, of course, arranged locally with the representatives of the Timorese, with the local communities. We ensure that UNTAET police are deployed in those areas, and there is also monitoring of

the returnees both by UNHCR and UNTAET once they return. There have been a few incidents when some of the returnees have been suspected, rightly or wrongly, by the local population of belonging to, or having been active in, the militia, but, by and large, that process has so far proceeded without too many difficulties.

There was also a question on the status of national reconciliation and how that is proceeding. Clearly, the best expression of national reconciliation in East Timor is the National Consultative Council. The National Consultative Council includes not only the CNRT, which is itself a broad umbrella organization for several political parties, but also includes representatives from the pro-autonomy parties. You will recall that three seats had been reserved for the pro-autonomy parties in the National Consultative Council. Two of those have been filled. The third one has not yet been filled, because the party concerned was somewhat controversial, to say the least, and emotions in some quarters in East Timor are still running high after last year's tragic events.

There was a question on the recent agreement with the World Bank in the health sector. I must confess that I do not have detailed information on that today, but I can tell the Council the following about the health sector: some 80 health facilities have been opened throughout East Timor. These include 50 mobile clinics, involving some 838 health workers. The interim health authority that has been established for East Timor is now staffed with 29 East Timorese professionals, 13 district health officers and seven international staff. It is envisaged that each district will have a lead non-governmental organization in the health field, which will work in that district and carry out programmes on behalf of the Transitional Administration. At the present time, Médecins sans Frontières is present in a number of districts in East Timor and has the largest presence among non-governmental organizations in the territory.

I think that covers some of the main issues that have been raised. Again, I apologize if I have not been able to provide detailed answers to all the questions that have been raised.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Mr. Annabi for his comprehensive and very detailed responses.

Mr. van Walsum (Netherlands): I am grateful to Mr. Annabi, and I apologize for inflicting such detailed questions on him, knowing full well that he has in fact been briefing us all day long.

Mr. Annabi has now supplied us with further information on the reductions in the military component of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) that are currently envisaged. I would like to say only that, obviously, we appreciate receiving that information, but that my delegation continues to insist on a proper discussion of the military and security situation in East Timor, either in an open Council meeting or in consultations of the whole, before any of these envisaged decisions become final.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I believe that the President for the month of June will take note of the request made by the representative of the Netherlands.

Let me take this opportunity to thank representatives for the kind words they addressed to me in the course of their statements.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4148

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4148th meeting

Wednesday, 31 May 2000, 4 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Listre
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Lalani
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Mr. Ward
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Ouane
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Minton

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2000/459).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-45311 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2000/459)

The President (spoke in Chinese): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, document S/2000/459.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/2000/482, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/2000/482) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (spoke in Chinese): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1300 (2000).

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

> "As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2000/459) states, in paragraph 11: 'Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.' That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2000/19.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4149

Security Council

Fifty-fifth year

Provisional

4149th meeting

Wednesday, 31 May 2000, 4.30 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Wang Yingfan	(China)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Listre
	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	Canada	Mr. Lalani
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Jamaica	Mr. Ward
	Malaysia	Mr. Mohammad Kamal
	Mali	Mr. Ouane
	Namibia	Mr. Andjaba
	Netherlands	Mr. van Walsum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Minton

Agenda

The situation concerning Western Sahara

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/461)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

00-45594 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning Western Sahara

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/2000/461)

The President (spoke in Chinese): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara, document S/2000/461.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/2000/500, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Andjaba (Namibia): Let me first and foremost thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, and his Personal Envoy, Mr. Baker, for the work they are doing to resolve the question of Western Sahara.

Nevertheless, the last two reports of the Secretary-General on Western Sahara — S/2000/131 of 17 February 2000 and S/2000/461 of 22 May 2000 — contain some observations with which my delegation does not agree.

My delegation wishes to reiterate that the United Nations settlement plan remains the only viable mechanism by which to achieve a lasting solution to the question of Western Sahara. The United Nations plan will enable the people of Western Sahara to exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and 40/50 of 2 December 1985, and with resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June 1983.

Namibia fully supports the recommendation of the Secretary-General to extend the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) until July 2000, notwithstanding some observations in the Secretary-General's report that have serious political implications and that cause concern to my delegation. My delegation cannot endorse observations which seek to diverge from the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. It is for that reason that my delegation will not support the draft resolution before us.

Mr. van Walsum (Netherlands): My delegation feels that the draft resolution on which we are about to vote does not adequately reflect the continued commitment to the settlement plan which during the Council's consultations was expressed by a large number of delegations, including my own.

It is true that in the fifth preambular paragraph the Council reiterates its full support for the continued efforts to implement the settlement plan, but the abrupt addition by which it subsequently notes that fundamental differences remain to be resolved produces a somewhat disingenuous overtone which does not do justice to the importance that the Council has claimed to attach to the settlement plan for many years. If we are nevertheless prepared to vote for the draft resolution it is because we do not want to block any avenue the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy may wish to follow in the discharge of his mandate to explore ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to the dispute over Western Sahara.

Mr. Ward (Jamaica): We too wish to thank the Secretary-General for his report and for his efforts, through his Personal Envoy, to bring peace to Western Sahara. Jamaica continues to believe that the settlement plan can be implemented, and that it is important for the referendum to be held as soon as possible. The referendum is what Jamaica believes will provide legitimacy for the process leading to the peaceful resolution of this dispute.

The mandate given to the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General, Mr. James A. Baker III, in 1997 called for him to assess the implementability of the plan, to examine ways of improving the chances of resuming its implementation in the near future and, if there were none, to advise on other possible ways of moving the peace process forward.

The reports presented so far to the Security Council indicate that there are divergences between the parties. They make it quite clear that the expected referendum will not take place any time soon. However, the reports have not concretely assessed the implementability of the plan. Nor have they been the basis for a determination by the Security Council of whether or not the plan is implementable.

It is against that background that Jamaica believes that the current draft resolution seeking the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) is not appropriate, because it implies that there are doubts within the Security Council as to the implementability of the settlement plan. Jamaica believes that the draft resolution should be purely technical and that any political provisions should be left for a separate draft resolution after the Council has received a report from the Personal Envoy.

Jamaica believes that the final phrase of paragraph 1 — "and explore all ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to their dispute over Western Sahara" (S/2000/500) — could be interpreted as a clear signal to the parties to the dispute that the settlement plan might indeed be jettisoned without the benefit of full compliance with the mandate given to the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General. Jamaica welcomes the fact that paragraph 2 requests the Secretary-General to provide an assessment of the situation before the end of the present mandate. That should be the report in which the assessment of implementability is done, which would allow the Security Council to advise on other possible ways of moving the peace process forward should there be agreement that the plan cannot be implemented.

This draft resolution, in suggesting ways and means to move forward, implies a judgement prior to hearing from the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy and before there has been an opportunity to discuss his report. The Security Council, by adopting this draft resolution, will not be following its own mandated procedure.

Jamaica reiterates its full support for the settlement plan and for the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara.

For the foregoing reasons, Jamaica will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before us.

Mr. Ouane (Mali) (spoke in French): My delegation takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 2000, document S/2000/461. That report indicates that implementation of the United Nations settlement plan with a view to holding a referendum on self-determination in Western Sahara has been hampered for the past nine years because of fundamental differences between the parties with respect to the interpretation of some of the main provisions of the plan. There is every reason to believe that the referendum cannot be held within the desired time-frame.

In this connection, I wish to point out that Mali, which has always supported efforts made by our Organization through the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara, remains convinced that the settlement plan is the appropriate framework for the organization and holding of a referendum on self-determination for the people of Western Sahara.

Mali had hoped that the Council would arrive at a text that took the concerns of all parties broadly into account. We therefore regret that the efforts made have not yielded this result. At this stage, I praise your personal efforts, Sir, to arrive at a balanced text. My delegation would have wished the draft resolution on which the Council is about to vote to be a presidential text reflecting the unanimous support of Council members for the efforts of the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General. In the absence of consensus on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, my delegation cannot vote in favour of this text. We will not, however, oppose its adoption. Accordingly, my delegation will abstain in the voting.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate my delegation's full support for the efforts of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General.

The President (spoke in Chinese): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of China.

We have taken note of the fact that divergent opinions remain with regard to elements of the draft resolution before us. We had proposed pursuing the process of consultations in order to arrive at a text acceptable to all. The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution because we believe that an extension of the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara will help to maintain stability and peace in that region and assist the parties concerned, with the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy, in finding an appropriate, feasible and lasting solution to existing problems. We hope that, in this process, the views of the parties concerned will be carefully heeded so as to prevent new problems from arising in the region.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I shall now put the draft resolution (S/2000/500) to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Malaysia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Namibia

Abstaining:

Jamaica, Mali

The President (spoke in Chinese): There were 12 votes in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 1301 (2000).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Listre (Argentina) (spoke in Spanish): The Argentine Republic voted in favour of the resolution extending the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) to 31 July 2000. However, it profoundly regrets the fact that, despite the efforts that have been made, it was not possible to achieve a consensus text. We feel that we came very close. My delegation, along with others seated around this table, made serious efforts to achieve it. In this regard, I wish to pay particular tribute to you, Mr. President, for your endeavours to achieve this, demonstrating once again the skill and intelligence with which you have conducted our work throughout this month.

Argentina reaffirms its support for the settlement plan. We believe that every effort should be made to find a mutually acceptable arrangement within that plan. In our view, significant progress has been made in its implementation. We are aware of the difficulties involved. At this stage, we feel that the most important aspect relates to the issue of appeals, but we do not believe it to be an insurmountable obstacle.

We therefore call on the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO to give their broadest cooperation to Mr. James Baker, the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General, and to demonstrate a constructive spirit of cooperation in order to find mutually acceptable solutions within the settlement plan. Argentina believes that other alternatives to the settlement plan can be considered only once all the possibilities for agreement within it have been exhausted, ensuring that all parties consent to any consideration of other negotiating approaches.

The President (spoke in Chinese): I thank the representative of Argentina for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Mohammad Kamal (Malaysia): My delegation would like to underline its deep regret that the Council was unable to reach consensus on the resolution we have just adopted. It is unfortunate that the sponsors of the text did not share the view that adopting a technical resolution today to extend the mandate of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) would have sufficed while awaiting further discussion on a more substantive text that would better reflect the commitment of the Council to the settlement plan.

We wish to underline Malaysia's continued full support for the United Nations settlement plan, which we still believe to be a viable one, and hope that an early, durable and peaceful resolution of the dispute will be achievable in the not-too-distant future. In this regard, we join the call for the parties to the dispute to bring concrete solutions to the meeting to be held with the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy in order to resolve all outstanding settlement plan issues.

We voted in favour of the resolution, as we fully support the efforts of MINURSO to implement the United Nations settlement plan and agreements adopted by the parties to hold a free, fair and impartial referendum for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. We also support the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 31 July 2000, in the expectation that the parties will offer the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy specific and concrete proposals that can be agreed to in order to resolve the outstanding problems relating to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

Mr. Minton (United States of America): We support the Secretary-General in his efforts, as embodied in the observations and recommendations in his report, to find a peaceful, sustainable solution to the long-standing dispute in Western Sahara, and urge other members of the Council to do the same.

We support the Secretary-General's proposed length of mandate and sought to hew as closely as possible to his language in explaining why this period is appropriate and necessary. Divorcing the length of the mandate renewal from the reasoning behind it would have made no sense. Like the Secretary-General, we support exerting every effort to overcome difficulties and promote implementation of the settlement plan. At the same time, we believe that the Secretary-General has been clear and frank in his last three reports over six months in telling the Council of the difficulties of bringing the process to resolution. Ignoring these realities will not fix them.

Therefore, we believe the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy should have full leeway and authority to work with the parties as the Secretary-General and his Envoy see necessary in order to find ways that are acceptable to the parties — and I stress the need for such acceptance — to peacefully resolve their dispute over the Territory. Indeed, this breadth of mandate for the Personal Envoy is the same as was endorsed unanimously by the Council in 1997 and reaffirmed in February of this year, also unanimously.

We call on both parties to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy in their efforts to find a way forward. For that reason we support this resolution and voted in favour of it.

In closing, allow me to echo the words of the Argentine Ambassador and thank you, Mr. President, for your leadership in steering the Council through what has been a very difficult discussion and vote. I think your leadership has greatly helped us see the issue clearly and will, as the Council remains seized of this issue, help form the basis on which we can find unity in the future. That is certainly our hope and our belief.

The President (spoke in Chinese): I thank the representative of the United States for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers on my list.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Statement by the President

The President (spoke in Chinese): As the President of the Council for this month, I would like to conclude with a few remarks.

In a few hours the month of May will come to an end. This afternoon's meeting is the last under my presidency for this month. This is the first time that I have served as President of the Council, and in terms of our work, this month has been busier and more intense than I had expected. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my colleagues for their cooperation and support. I would also like to thank all members of the Secretariat, including the secretaries, interpreters and translators, for their help. Without their assiduous work, it would have been difficult for the Security Council to work efficiently and effectively during this month.

It is my sincere hope that Ambassador Levitte, next month's Council President, will have better luck than I have had.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.